The Catholic University Bulletin.

Vol. XVII. *February, 1911.* *No. 2.*

"Let there be progress, therefore; a widespread and eager progress in every century and epoch, both of individuals and of the general body, of every Christian and of the whole Church, a progress in intelligence, knowledge and wisdom, but always within their natural limits, and without sacrifice of the identity of Catholic teaching, feeling and opinion."—ST. VINCENT OF LERINS, *Commonit, c. 6.*

PUBLISHED BY

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

WASHINGTON, D. C.

J. H. FURST COMPANY, PRINTERS,
BALTIMORE.

The
Catholic University Bulletin.

Vol. XVII. *February, 1911.* *No. 2.*

THE NEW SCHOOL OF AMERICAN HISTORIANS.

Part I.

During the past summer many important works were added to our library of American history. Of these accessions perhaps the most useful are the twenty-seven volumes entitled, *The American Nation: A History. From Original Materials by Associated Scholars.*[1] This coöperative work was edited by Dr. Albert Bushnell Hart, an eminent professor of history in Harvard University. An advertisement informs the reader that the editor was advised by committees representing several historical societies. These volumes, prepared by specialists, are designed to form a consecutive history of the United States. Those that appear to require notice will be examined in the pages of *The Bulletin.*

The first volume of the series, the *European Background of American History,* was prepared by a very competent scholar, Professor Edward P. Cheyney, of the University of Pennsylvania. An appropriate portrait, Henry, Infante of Portugal, has been chosen for the frontispiece. Much is suggested by his armorial cross and by his motto, *talent de bienfaire.* Henry the Navigator, indeed, may be fairly regarded as the author or originator of continuous modern geographical discovery. His work will presently be noticed.

[1] New York and London: Harper & Brothers, Publishers.

In the idea of introducing a work on American history by an ample narrative of conditions preceding the era of Columbus there is nothing new. Such a method of treating United States history was in the mind of this writer when, in 1892, he prepared for *The Catholic World* an article entitled, "The Church as A Geographical Society." That re-study of familiar topics was not printed, however, until 1897, and it is mentioned now merely to show that in many Catholic schools something of the subject matter of Professor Cheyney's interesting book has long been taught. Moreover, an examination of this old essay will show that while it ascribed to the apostolic spirit of the Catholic Church a considerable share in the extension of geographical knowledge, this new book places the chief emphasis upon the influence of commerce. Were the writer to re-state his conclusions, he would put a little more stress on the influence of commerce and scientific curiosity in making known the extent of the world, but with his present information he could not assign to the missionary spirit a smaller share in effecting the result. Though the essay was brief, it suggested an ample field. Indeed, several of the topics then noticed have not been considered in Professor Cheyney's splendid summary. *His* volume looks forward to the Columbian discovery of America, and in justification of his method it might be readily admitted that the contact of Irish monks with the island of Iceland was so early in point of time and so remotely connected with the Columbian discovery of America that any principle of composition which would require its inclusion would also necessitate at least a brief account of the siege of Troy. With an account of the influence of the apostolic spirit of the Christian Church in extending the limits of geographical knowledge the sojourn of Irish monks in Iceland *is* very closely connected. It was, in fact, an emanation of missionary zeal, and it does not diminish the merit of that act even if Iceland's shores had been trodden still earlier by Norwegian castaways.

Though a discussion of Norse activity in Iceland, Greenland and Vineland might seem to lie within the scope of this volume,

that interesting episode is passed almost without observation. The reason for this is plain. Professor Cheyney does not believe that traditions concerning Vineland had any influence on the mind of Columbus, even if he had ever visited Iceland and had learned there something of the contents of those sagas that mention the voyages to *Vineland the Good.* In ecclesiastical history this epoch is of very great interest, and in the extension of geographical knowledge it forms a very important chapter. Taking for a guide the fine monograph of the Jesuit Fischer it would have been easy to prepare a few pages concerning Iceland, Greenland and Vineland, in that part of our planet the lonely outposts of Christianity.

School children generally arrive somehow at the conclusion that before the great era of discovery Europeans knew little of Asia beyond its western coast. As a matter of fact, they had learned much concerning its extent, its resources and its people. After a perusal of the *European Background of American History* no writer of a school history of the United States will have any excuse for his failure to devote at least a few pages to the actual condition of geographical science during the boyhood of Columbus. This, however, was not the only topic that the plan of Professor Cheyney compelled him to discuss, and of necessity he could sketch this part of this theme only in outline. This he has done admirably.

What the people of southern Europe knew of the orient has been skillfully summarized in his chapter on "Italian Contributions to Exploration (1200-1500)." The work of the Neapolitan Friar, John de Plano Carpini, is briefly related. There is also included a sketch of William de Rubruquis, a Fleming sent by Louis IX to visit the Mongol emperor. Odoric de Pordenone and John of Monte Corvino are also named. The author tells us that they wrote rather full accounts of India, of southern Asia and even of China. In this connection the article in *The Catholic World* might have suggested to Professor Cheyney a page that would have been new to most of his readers. Among other things, it says that Marco Polo "had scarcely quitted his royal employment at

Pekin when, in 1295, a Franciscan friar, John of Monte Corvino, began his labors in the most populous part of the pagan world. Years of sacrifice and toil were finally rewarded by a multitude of converts; the faithful missionary was joined by numerous coadjutors, and, soon after, consecrated Archbishop of Pekin, then called *Cambulac*. The beginning of the fourteenth century saw Christianity flourishing in all the principal cities of eastern China; the fair province [of Cathay] was illuminated by the light of the gospel, and it then seemed as if the religion and civilization of Europe was about to become permanently established among the disciples of Confucius." For the remainder of this strange story the reader is referred to *The Catholic World* of February, 1897. From this excerpt he will be at no loss to understand why people in Avignon and in Rome knew so much about Cathay.

The activity of Italian explorers in the west also is properly emphasized. The author mentions Cadamosto, Columbus, Cabot, Verrazzano and Vespucci and states that they were simply the most famous. In developing this thought he says: "Educated men from Venice, Genoa, Pisa and Florence emigrated to other lands, carrying with them science, skill, and ingenuity unknown except in the advanced and enterprising Italian city republics and principalities. Italian mathematicians made the calculations on which all navigation was based; Italian cartographers drew maps and charts; Italian ship-builders designed and built the best vessels of the time; Italian captains commanded them, and very often Italian sailors made up their crews; while at least in the earlier period Italian bankers advanced the funds with which the expeditions were equipped and sent out."

Another interesting section discusses the "Pioneer Work of Portugal (1400-1527)." Of course this chapter is chiefly devoted to the explorations directed by Prince Henry. It is sufficiently ample, but it is rather unfortunate that the author does not emphasize one of the most important of the influences that sustained Henry during his two-score years of continuous interest in discovery. That prince promptly conveyed to the

Pope an account of his discoveries, solicited an approval of these enterprises, and, foreseeing that many voyages would follow, prayed for a "concession in perpetuity to the crown of Portugal of whatever lands might be discovered beyond Cape Bojador to the Indies inclusive," especially submitting to His Holiness that "*the salvation of the natives was the principal object of his labors.*" It should be remembered that Prince Henry died in the year 1460, yet he states distinctly that one of the objects of his systematic exploration was to reach the Indies, that another, and a principal one, was "the salvation of the natives." In the frontispiece his portrait shows an armorial cross. Those captains whom he sent from Point Sagres, says Professor Cheyney, marked by "stone pillars six feet high" the limits of their successive voyages along the African shore. According to very good authority these stone pillars were *crosses.* It may have been what the author calls the somewhat "grotesque piety of the fifteenth century" that marked the progress of discovery by the emblem of Christianity. But what was the motive that led on June 1, 1491, *more than fifteen months before the discovery of America,* to the dedication by the Portuguese of a Catholic Church on the banks of the Congo?

The development of the African slave trade is mentioned in the same connection. It might have been added that not a few of the negroes were brought to Portugal, carefully instructed in the Christian faith and returned to their old homes to do missionary work among their respective tribes. The expectation of results from these efforts appears to have been disappointed. Unfortunately this was not the only purpose for which negroes were kidnaped. As the narration of these facts fixes upon a Catholic nation the odium of developing that detestable traffic, it should have been stated that the institution of human slavery has been condemned by a long line of Popes. Bancroft examined the record and Wendell Phillips ratified that historian's conclusions. Races that have, as well as races that have not been accused of "grotesque piety" imitated and even surpassed the Portuguese in organizing this unnatural

trade. Both France and Spain were implicated, and, if the writer's memory be not at fault, Hawkins' vessel, the *Jesus,* engaged early in the guilty traffic. The career of that connoisseur in negroes suggests the existence elsewhere, and at a time far later, of something resembling "grotesque piety." One may be allowed to suspect that Turner's *slave ship* was suggested by occurrences beyond the sphere of Portuguese influence. It is a familiar fact of our colonial history that the Dutch were the first to offer *negars* for sale in Jamestown. Even in the twentieth century it needs no microscopic eye to discover traces of the grotesque in any one of a multitude of creeds. To a considerable extent the matter seems to depend upon one's point of view. All this was very clear to the keen insight of Robert Burns.

> Orthodox, orthodox,
> All who believe in John Knox, etc.

The author's interesting discussion of the pioneer work of the Portuguese would have been a little improved by the addition of at least a brief notice of the attempts of early Genoese mariners, the brothers Vivaldi and others, to explore the African coast. Those voyages, it is true, were made more than a century before the Portuguese took up the work. The spirit of research that marks our own age may yet recover some dusty parchments that will establish a more substantial connection between the early explorations of the Italians and the later maritime activity of the Portuguese. It is not a little suggestive of Italian enterprise in that early age that the very decade (1290-1300) which saw Friar John of Monte Corvino treading a dangerous path through Tartarian wilds to his destination at Pekin also beheld Ugolino de Vivaldi, a Genoese seaman, following southward a perilous course along the shores of Africa.

It was not seriously to be expected that a non-Catholic author, even a scholarly one, would see all these topics precisely as a Catholic writer would, or, seeing them, that he would estimate them as of the same worth. It is true that they are

equally impressed by the remarkable enterprise of the Portuguese. Nevertheless, one considers slavery the economic basis of African exploration, and in his account gives it the place of prominence, while in the enthusiasm of Prince Henry and his successors the other perceives motives less sordid and more powerful. Remembering many achievements of those times, he would linger with pleasure on the force of scientific curiosity, on the passion for fame and on the hope of converting to Christianity countless multitudes of heathens. The expectation of territorial accessions and the hope of ultimate profits from the oriental trade might fairly be classed as economic motives. To a Catholic the participation of the Portuguese in the African slave trade seems no more than a tragic episode in the mysterious drama that the centuries were unfolding.

In different ages there have doubtless been Catholics of nearly every station who have declared their belief in human slavery, and not a few, perhaps, who have labored to perpetuate the institution. Nevertheless, it has not been the policy of their Church nor has it been the teaching of their great moral leaders. Slavery, indeed, is far more ancient than the Christian Church. It was chiefly the commercial greed of the Portuguese that led them temporarily to turn aside from exploration and legitimate trade. At the very worst, they did not continue forever to sport with Amaryllis in her tropic shades. They resumed their lawful enterprises and by means no less honorable than those of rival nations built up a splendid colonial empire. Moreover, in this peculiar Guinea trade they appear to have been, even in their palmy days, mere retailers compared to those later *entrepreneurs,* who developed the business on a bolder and grander scale.

The author's succeeding chapter, "The Spanish Monarchy in The Age of Columbus," is not inferior in interest to any of those that have been discussed. Among other topics it considers very fully the *hermandads* or brotherhoods, quasi-military societies revived after the accession of Isabella. The objects of their organization, as well as their powers and functions, are correctly stated. It would seem that the reader is

carefully prepared for a very important announcement, but the matter is not even alluded to. Nor has its consideration been adjourned to the third volume of the series. We are told that the *Santa Hermandad* was empowered to lay and collect taxes, and the author should have added that it was from the treasury of this useful society that Isabella obtained the funds with which to equip the first expedition of Columbus. If there is any event in the European background of American history that is intimately connected with the discovery of the New World, it is that which relates to the manner of financing this memorable enterprise. Oftentimes the assertion is made that " it was not jewels but Jews " that furnished the funds for the equipment. In his exhaustive volumes John Boyd Thacher has made popular the documentary proofs concerning it. " In the archives of Simancas," says that author, " are still preserved the account books of the Hermandad, whose treasurers were Luis de Santangel and Francisco Pinelo." [2] Thacher pays a high compliment to the Spanish Jews, the converted as well as the unconverted; he describes with much detail the various systems by which they were punished; the murder by them of Canon Arbués, the chief Inquisitor, and the confiscations that followed. Indeed, his digression on Spanish Jews extends about as far as the rules of rhetoric would justify. Nevertheless, though he mentions Luis de Santangel, the Escribano de Racion, and Gabriel Sanchez as important among the *dramatis personae,* nowhere does he state that the cost of that expedition was borne, or even in part subscribed to, by members of that enterprising race.

The entire fund may be divided into two parts, *viz.,* the *one eighth* part contributed by Columbus himself and the *seven eighths* supplied by the Crown of Castile. It is not known from what source Columbus received the one eighth that, it is universally admitted, was advanced in his behalf. It has been surmised that it was obtained from the Duke of Medina Celi, who was himself greatly interested in exploration, and whose guest Columbus had been for nearly two years

[2] *Columbus,* I, p. 457.

preceding the voyage of discovery. With the royal seven-eighths it is different. This portion came from the treasury of the *Santa Hermandad,* and there are several records of the transaction.[3]

In one of the account books of Garcia Martinez and Pedro de Montemayor, constituting Bulls of the Bishopric of Palencia from the year 1484 and following, Navarrete found this entry:

"Dió y pagó mas el dicho Alonso de las Cabezas (tesorero de la Cruzada, en el Obispado de Bajadoz) por otro libramiento del dicho Arzobispo de Granada, fecho 5 de Mayo de 92 años, á Luis de Santangel, Escribano de Racion del Rey, nuestro Señor, é por él á Alonso de Angulo, por virtud de un poder que del dicho Escribano de Racion mostró, en el cual estaba inserto dicho libramiento, doscientos mil maravedis, en cuenta de cuatrocientos mil que en él, en Vasco de Quiroga, le libró el dicho Arzobispo por el dicho libramiento de dos cuentos seiscientos cuarenta mil maravedis que hobo de haber en esta manera: un cuento y quinientos mil maravedis para pagar á D. Isag Abrahan por otro tanto que prestó á sus Altezas para los gastos de la guerra, *é el un cuento ciento cuarenta mil maravedis restantes para pagar al dicho Escribano de Racion en cuenta de otro tanto que prestó para la paga de las carabelas que sus Altezas mandaron ir de armada á las Indias, é para pagar á Cristobal Colon que va en la dicha armada.*"[4]

In English the italicized part of this entry reads: "and the 1,140,000 maravedis remaining to pay the said Escribano de Racion on account of a like sum which he loaned to pay for the caravels which their Highnesses ordered to go as a fleet to the Indies, and to pay to Christopher Columbus, who went in the said fleet." Luis de Santangel, a converted Jew, in his capacity as an officer of the Hermandad advanced the seven eighths contributed by the Crown of Castile. He did not put his hand into his own pocket, as John Fiske conjectured, but merely loaned money of which he was one of the custodians. This *with interest* was subsequently repaid to the Hermandad.

[3] Thacher's *Columbus*, I, pp. 457–463.

[4] Thacher's *Columbus*, I, p. 459.

Professor Cheyney tells us nothing of all this, though he does find space for an account of that characteristic Spanish institution, the Inquisition. *That* is treated at length because of its supposed connection with the decline of Spanish glory.

Other contemporary records show that it was *by* the *Santa Hermandad* that seven eighths of the sum necessary for the equipment was furnished, and that it was *to* this organization that the sum of 1,140,000 maravedis was repaid. This amount included interest, which at that time seems to have been paid as well by sovereign as subject. The historian Thacher assumes that the cash cost of this famous expedition was:

Advanced the enterprise by the Crown of Castile, .	1,000,000	maravedis.
Advanced the enterprise by Christopher Columbus, .	167,542	"
Total, ...	1,167,542	"

The same authority has undertaken the very intricate task of converting this sum, 1,167,542 maravedis, into its present equivalent in United States money. On that subject he says that the actual amount expended was $7,203.73, and that " it is doubtful if $80,000 would to-day accomplish what was then done." [5]

It is highly probable that the researches of the future will throw still more light upon the details of the equipment. Even now we know the names of the intrepid companions of Columbus, and from ship-boy to captain can calculate to within a dollar or two what was paid to each. " Not jewels but Jews: " it goes sore against us to spoil a flashy phrase, but, like the Ancient Mariner, the muse of history rests uneasily until her tale is told.

In its conquering age Spanish heroism performed memorable deeds. It broke the military spirit of the Caliphs and saved Gaul not only from a second invasion but from possible Mahommedan domination. In the first quarter of the fifteenth century there was in France no Charles Martel, and the shepherdess of Lorraine might have found it a far more difficult task to

[5] Thacher's *Columbus*, I, pp. 480–490.

expel a Moorish, than it actually was to defeat an English army. The capture of Constantinople in 1453 struck terror into the powers of Central Europe but that event, though momentous in its consequences, was almost balanced by the fall of Granada nearly forty years later. By engaging the enemy in Spain, the other states of western Europe were free to carry the war into the land of the Saracen and the Turk. Thereafter, Europe was not often in danger from the hordes of Asia. When it was menaced, the chivalry of Spain was conspicuous among the defenders of Christian civilization. With the gallant Venetians and the legions of the Pope the Spaniard met the Turk at Lepanto. Other victories not less renowned were won on other fields.

Spain discovered a new world; she opened up to European commerce the trade of the Pacific and she circumnavigated the globe; her dauntless mariners traced the winding shores of the Atlantic from Nova Scotia to Cape Horn and the coast of the Pacific from Magellan's Straits almost to the Columbia. Spain, too, introduced into northern Africa most of those elements of civilization that are now to be found there. In the New World she established an empire stretching from the prairies of the Missouri to the plains of Patagonia. These achievements are among the venerable commonplaces of history.

In the field of early exploration, 1492-1576, the triumphs of England and of France seem insignificant if compared with those of Spain. In conquest and in colonization they were as far behind her. It was not in its New World seminaries of learning, though they were numerous and, for the time, admirable, that Spain stood, as she did, without a peer. It was in her grand endeavor to lift millions of Indians in their aboriginal forests to the plane of European religion and civilization, one of the grand achievements of recorded time.

This is not the Spain of our day nor is it the Spain that Americans have been taught to know. The country so familiar to us was the tender nurse of Anti-Semitic prejudice, the country whose entire literature is comprised in a fantastic story by Cervantes, and whose military glory commenced and cul-

minated in the exploits of General Weyler. The adventurers that crowd and jostle one another in the pages of our school books, and of whom, even yet, a few survive in the columns of our Sunday newspapers, were monsters of cruelty, who destroyed in America two civilizations each superior to their own. Such a nation could easily and with impunity be despoiled of its honors and its triumphs. The *real* Spain is as different from this caricature as were the Christian churches, founded by the Spaniards, from those fearful Aztec temples that forever smoked with human sacrifice and dripped with human blood. *This* was the spiritual side of the civilizations effaced by the *conquistador*.

Spain broke down in the endeavor to achieve what no nation, ancient or modern, has ever attempted. For the loss of her colonial dependencies she consoled herself by the reflection that before surrendering them to mankind she had implanted in them the elements of civilization. It needs no prophetic eye to behold the future of Latin America and to see in that part of the globe the development of colossal nations.

Amidst the wildernesses of mighty continents, on unnumbered islands in the watery waste, in remote and unknown archipelagos the Spaniards sought to civilize a multitude of races of whom even the most advanced had scarcely attained to the upper stages of barbarism. In that grand undertaking they fell short of perfect success. If, to-day, there are to be found in the former colonial empire of Spain millions of dusky pepople with a tincture of civilization, let them, and let their rulers thank the patient, toilsome friar. With his acknowledged limitations this spiritual hero achieved in apostolic fields triumphs as unique as they were grand. In a little while he will everywhere be superseded in his sublime office. To him the new missionary methods speak feebly. The rush of innovation affords no breathing-space for readjustment. Let him continue still to face his old horizon and with radiant nimbus pass onward into the realms of light.

It has long been known that members of the oppressed Jewish race were friendly to the projects of Columbus but it

is only within recent years that there has been any serious attempt to represent his grand achievement as a result of Jewish philanthropy or Jewish foresight. At this moment there are indications that such an endeavor is encouraged. Men of much enthusiasm and of some scholarship are making the American people familiar with the idea that it was not the rulers and the natural leaders of Spain but the stranger within her gates that patronized the most memorable of maritime expeditions. The friendship for Columbus of a few members of their race is a fine circumstance of which Jewish people generally may well be proud. The incident, however, is no more than a brief and fleeting scene in a drama of many acts. In all the great maritime movements that preceded the discovery, the share of the Jews may be set down as almost a negligible quantity. In all the great nautical events that followed it, they were not more conspicuous. Of course, intelligent Jews were to be found among the crews of many enterprises of that great epoch, but they were serving in stations more or less subordinate. They did not furnish the mathematicians, the cartographers, the naval architects, the captains or even the bankers concerned in those ventures. Collectively the exceptions form no lengthy list.

The species of historical interpretation that seeks to withhold from the Latin races the renown that they have won in the field of geographical extension pleasantly reminds us of that school of literary criticism which isolates Shakespeare and then endeavors to understand him. It has developed an ingenious and indefatigable band of mutineers, who have misapplied their talents and forged for our entertainment Baconian and other extravagant theories. If we would understand the art of gentle Shakespeare, we must first become familiar with the great literary movement that extended from the days of his boyhood to the accession of Charles I. Shakespeare was the greatest representative of our greatest literary epoch; possibly he *warbled his native wood-notes wild,* though we don't believe it, Milton to the contrary. Not a little of Shakespeare's poetry was surpassed by the best work of the ablest of his predecessors.

Though in the great bulk of his writings he towers above them all, he does not stand apart—preëminent and unrelated. Columbus, too, was a product of his times, the greatest among a giant race of nautical heroes. He was not, however, the only mariner of that day who voyaged through strange seas. Five years after the discovery of America, Vasco da Gama, when only half-way to India, had made a voyage which, in its extent, surpassed any that Columbus had ever known. Still later Magellan performed a deed of equal note. The Portuguese explorations, suggested no doubt by those of the Italian mariners of the thirteenth century, had no connection with the cherished projects of Spain. Indeed, one of their expeditions to India discovered South America as early as the year 1500. In other words, the Portuguese made an independent discovery of our southern continent. That epoch was one of marvellous nautical activity among several of the Latin nations. The maritime glory of England, of France and of Holland had not yet reached its full noon-day splendor. It was Italy, Portugal and Spain that were then winning renown in the field of exploration. The aims, the ambitions, the achievements of navigators were merely the elements of mighty movements—movements that disdained the control of obscure sects, of cities, of councils or even of governments; mysterious forces that were broadening all the realms of knowledge.

Of all its sections perhaps that most valuable part of this book is that which treats of the system of chartered commercial companies, 1550-1700, and the more important of the colonizing companies. By his power of condensation the author carries his reader over large and sometimes pathless tracts of literature. His sketch of *The Protestant Reformation on the Continent* does not, of course, discuss the causes of the revolt of Luther but it does set forth clearly how the spiritual unrest from 1500-1625 influenced the character of those continental emigrants who had concluded to build new homes in America. There is likewise a good outline of the religious wars in the Netherlands and in Germany. The progress of the Reformation in England and the rise of Puritanism are concisely related.

As an acquaintance with the author's introductory chapters is nearly indispensable to the acquisition of any scientific knowledge of the political history of the United States, so will his concluding sections on local government in England (after 1600) be of great assistance to students of our constitutional history. The final chapters offer to the reader a splendid epitome of those units of local government that were soon to reappear in modified form in the North American colonies of England.

Many readers of American history have doubtless observed that the time-honored method of introducing it has been marked by more or less abruptness. The writer believes that, at least in part, our civilization has descended from the foremost files of time and that if we are to comprehend it, we must search out and examine the early memorials of the nations. As it has been with civilization so has it been with many epoch-making events, they have been matured by the process of the centuries.

While engaged, nearly twenty years ago, in a study of Bancroft and other historians of our colonial era, the writer was impressed with the isolation of American history and then suggested some of the older movements with which he believed it to be connected. Now that this idea has had the practical approval of academic authorities he may be pardoned for quoting from an almost forgotten essay.

> Every thoughtful student of American history must have observed with surprise the abruptness with which it is invariably introduced. This criticism applies with equal force to all writers upon the subject, whether eminent or obscure. A brief eulogy upon the genius and character of Columbus, a rapid sketch of the more important voyages of the Spanish, English, and French navigators, and the reader finds himself, after the perusal of a few pages, entertained by a minute and often a tedious narrative of the struggling settlement at Jamestown. The hardships endured by the early colonists taught them to rely upon their powers, and accustomed them to those habits of self-government that laid the foundation of their future greatness. Indeed, if we wish clearly to comprehend the growth of civil liberty in America, no fact in any way affecting the first settlers is too insignificant to be recorded, and no objection is made to the fullness which characterizes nearly every work on this portion of our country's history; but if it be granted that the career of the United States has exerted an influence upon the progress of liberty and civilization, the nature of the forces which made known to

Europeans the existence of a new world is worthy the most patient investigation. Of the causes which led to the discovery of America at least one was remote; others had their origin long before the birth of Columbus. An attempt to trace the growth of all would form a lengthy introduction to a history of the United States. The historian must commence at some point, and it is objected only that he begins too near the middle of his subject.[7]

The study from which is quoted the preceding paragraph touched lightly the early voyages of the monks, the impetus given to discovery by the Crusades, and the splendid labors of the Franciscans in China. The essay also noticed the maritime activity and the religious zeal of the Portuguese, as well as the motives that solemnized the dreams of Columbus and Magellan. Many, *but not all* of these themes have been treated by Professor Cheyney. More than that, he has discussed them with fairness and ability.

The first volume of this new history of the United States is welcomed for the improvement that it brings, for its sincerity, for its scholarship. The reader will not fail to observe that though men of many nations participated in early overland journeys or in maritime exploits, the Italians far surpassed all other races. They were equally active in the remote East and in the seas beyond the Pillars of Hercules. With a few exceptions their adventures have been carefully described. It was not unreasonable to expect that a mass of testimony so overwhelming as that collected by the author would force him to pause in his labors long enough to record his admiration of a race that in our time it has not been the fashion to praise. Believing, apparently, that glory is an insubstantial thing, he writes without emotion, and prefers to let his muster of facts declare Italian intelligence and enterprise in the long epoch from the middle of the thirteenth to the beginning of the sixteenth century. Be it so. If the temple of History is guarded by the Angel of Research and the Angel of Meditation, Italy has little to fear from the chroniclers of the future.

A similar enumeration of achievements shows Portugal to have been a ready pupil of the progressive Italian states and

[7] *The Catholic World*, Vol. LXIV, p. 602.

to have accomplished works that to a less enterprising posterity must look like miracles. Less gifted descendants have not husbanded the grand inheritance transmitted to them, and the vast colonial empire founded by the immediate successors of Prince Henry, of Diaz and of Gama has been lost forever.

When Italy had trained the nations in navigation, the trident passed into the strong hand of Castile; thereafter epoch-making events traced their clear signatures upon the scroll of history. In recording even these the author's pen is touched by no gleam of inspiration. He announces the wonders of the modern world in a style as tranquil as if he were describing some trifling improvement in the rotation of crops.

This severely scientific method would have been justified, if the author were relating the triumphs of imperial Rome with her 120,000,000 people. Great deeds would have been expected from her boundless power. The style would not have been inappropriate if he were enumerating the successes of France, when for a quarter of a century she defied the might of continental Europe. It would not have been a theme for criticism, if he had been recording the splendid deeds of our own favored republic, in extent greater than the Rome of the Cæsars and almost as great in population. One could not fairly object to his manner, if he had been preparing for us a synopsis of German achievement. From the fine intelligence and the high social efficiency of that great nation we have a right to expect, whether in war or in peace, a long list of victories. With the least among these great states the Spanish monarchy of the era of Ferdinand and Isabella is not for a moment to be compared. Though in area somewhat large, its population, diminished by centuries of war, could not have been above 6,500,000. Nevertheless, it was this handful of people that won for Spain a splendid immortality and for Christianity vast realms where Chaos still held sway, regions that from the first had been consecrated to the powers of Night and Darkness.

CHARLES H. MCCARTHY.

THE PERSONALITY AND GENIUS OF ARISTOTLE.

We are nowadays very far removed from the customs and habits of thought which prevailed when Chaucer described the typical student as having

> At his beddes hed
> Twenty bookes clad in blake or red
> Of Aristotle and his philosophie.

In those days Aristotle's influence was at its maximum, and his philosophy was at the zenith of its popularity. To-day, it may safely be said, only the special student here and there, the student of Greek literature, or of philosophy, or of the history of science, is more than remotely interested in the man, and even the special student is very seldom interested in the philosophy of the man. If he is, his interest is purely critical or philological: he is a student of the letter and hardly ever sympathises with the spirit of the Aristotelian philosophy. Yet, it is possible even for the present day student to put himself frankly, though, not, I hope, uncritically, at Aristotle's own point of view. We cannot, even if we would, stem the tide of modern progress, or stay the onward movement of modern thought. But, we can, I believe, disregard them for the time being, go back in imagination and sympathy to Aristotle as he was, and study his philosophy as it is contained in his own writings. In this way, we may, perhaps, understand him, as he was understood by his own school, and criticise him as they did, appreciatively.

In some respects, the task before us ought to be an easy one. Common sense and our fixed habits of speech are on the side of Aristotle. It is true that all philosophy in the accepted meaning of the word, since the days of Hume, or, I may say, since the days of Descartes, is against him. Yet common sense is stronger than genius, even than philosophical genius, and I cannot but believe that the day of common sense will

come again, and, Aristotelianism, in spite of all the funeral orations pronounced over it, will come into its own once more. Besides, the philosophy of Aristotle is in agreement with the conclusions of natural science, as well as with common sense. It is in harmony with the spirit of investigation, and confirms when other philosophies tend to upset, the verdict of physical science. What it does not agree with is the metaphysics that happens to be in vogue. If we rid ourselves for the moment of metaphysical prejudice, put ourselves at the point of view of common sense, and concern ourselves for the time being with the verdict of common sense and the conclusions of modern science, we shall be in a position, I hope, to judge the Aristotelian philosophy on its own merits, and not be too hasty to condemn it.

On the other hand, there are difficulties in the way. Chief of all is a difficulty which is, to say the least, paradoxical when formulated. I mean the very familiarity of Aristotle's conclusions. In nine cases out of ten, the answer that Aristotle gives to the most profound questions of philosophy is the answer that would be given by a person who had never studied philosophy at all. In this respect, he is disappointing. He brings nothing new, nothing startling, nothing (shall I say?) sensational. He tells us, in effect that, like M. Jourdain, who for fifty years had been speaking prose without knowing it, we have been Aristotelians all our lives without suspecting that we were. He has moulded our thoughts, fashioned our forms of speech, and traced the lines along which we must reason if we are to reason validly. He has fixed the meanings of such terms as substance, quality, action, motion and so forth. He has even furnished the phraseology in which our formularies of Christian doctrine are drawn up. In a word, the Alphabet, so to speak, of the language in which the Western world thinks is Aristotelian in its origin. We must try to get out of this inheritance in order to appreciate its value. We must not be like him who could not see the wood for the trees. We must endeavor to go back in thought to the time when all this was new, to see what the world of thought

was before Aristotle came into it, to appreciate what he contributed, and to trace the subsequent working of that contribution as it leavened the mass of human knowledge. Briefly, I am asking the trained student of philosophy to forget, for the time being, his Descartes, his Hume, his Kant or his favorite pragmatist author. And I am asking the reader, whether he is or is not a trained student, to forget for the moment much that we all take for granted but which was really first said, or explained, or fixed as an acquisition of thought, by Aristotle. It is only in this way that the Aristotelian system may be observed in the making.

Aristotle, although a typical representative of the Greek spirit was, in one sense, not a Greek at all. He was born in 384 B. C. at Stagira, a seaport town of the colony of Chalcidice in Macedonia. He was, therefore, a native of that country which, in recent times receives mention every now and then in the news columns on account of its conflicts with Turkey. In the fourth century B. C. Macedonia was as yet almost unheard of in general history; its ruler was Amyntas, who was succeeded by Philip, as he, in turn, was succeeded by Alexander, the Conqueror. Strictly speaking, however, Aristotle was a Macedonian only in the sense in which the son of an American consul in Paris might be said to be a Frenchman. His father was Nicomachus, physician to the Macedonian king, and his grandfather, also a physician, had emigrated from Greece as one of a colony from Chalcis in Euboea. The language of Aristotle's home was, consequently, the Greek of Attica, and the education which he received, probably at home, was such as he should have received had he gone to school in some Greek city. When he was eighteen years old he went to Athens, and there, for the space of twenty years he listened to the lectures of Plato. Stories, originating for the most part from Aristotle's enemies, were current in antiquity to the effect that the relations between master and pupil were far from pleasant. Not only were there, as we shall see, differences of opinion between them on the most important points of doctrine, but there was also a fundamental disparity

of temperament which made it impossible that they should adopt the same or similar views. Plato was the dreamer, the poet, the seer; Aristotle was the scientist, the investigator, the observer of facts. Their outlook on life and on knowledge could not but be different. We need not, however, believe the legends which represent Aristotle as disrespectful and impertinent, and Plato as taking refuge in a dignified sense of insult and ingratitude. Aristotle's own works are our best evidence that his attitude towards his master was correct. "Plato is my friend, but truth is dearer even than Plato" may have been his motto. At any rate, there is a passage in his *Ethics* (1, 6) which reads like a commentary on that famous saying. Speaking of the theory of Ideas, which was Plato's most distinctive doctrine, he remarks, "Perhaps it would seem to be better, and even necessary, at least for the preservation of truth, that we should even do away with private feelings, especially as we are philosophers; for both being dear to us, it is a sacred duty to preserve truth." This, we should like to believe, was the sentiment that governed his conduct towards his aged teacher; and theirs, if it was the first, was not by any means the last, instance in which two great men succeded in preserving mutual respect and esteem in spite of a fundamental difference in character and convictions. Plato, we are told, referred to Aristotle's home as "the house of the reader," bearing ready tribute to the industry of his pupil, and the pupil on his side was never lacking in respect for the ripe wisdom of his master.

After Plato's death in 347 or 348 Aristotle spent some time at the court of Hermias, ruler of Atarneus, whose adopted daughter, Pythias, he married. From Asia Minor he returned in 343 to Macedonia at the invitation of Philip of Macedon in order to become preceptor of the young Alexander, who was destined to be the founder of one of the greatest empires in the history of the world. Alexander was then thirteen years old. There is extant a letter supposed to have been written by Philip thirteen years earlier in which the king says that "he is grateful to the gods, not so much because an heir is born

to his throne as because he is born in the time of Aristotle, trusting that, being nurtured and trained by such a philosopher, the boy may one day be a worthy successor to his father's glory and the conduct of affairs." The document can hardly be genuine, though there are scholars who maintain that it is. It seems to take too readily for granted the great fame both of Aristotle and Alexander, which is enough to justify the suspicion that it was written later. However this may be, Aristotle was invited by Philip to undertake the education of Alexander, and the relation was, as we know, beneficial to both. There are wanting details as to how Aristotle discharged his office as teacher. It is evident, however, that he paid attention not only to the intellectual but also to the moral training of his pupil. Alexander inherited from his father a violent, impetuous and passionate disposition. The excesses to which Philip was addicted—as is evidenced by the famous appeal "from Philip drunk to Philip sober"—left their impress in the temperament and disposition of Alexander. Too often, as we know, his tempestuous temper got the better of his prudence. But if he yielded at times to these impulses, it must be said that on the whole, he held them firmly in check, and in the most serious crises of his career he showed that the conqueror of the world could also be conqueror of his own worse nature. This moral victory—his greatest conquest, in our estimation—he owed in large measure to the lessons he received from Aristotle. On the other hand, the master profited by the generosity and friendship of his royal pupil. With the funds which Alexander placed at his disposal Aristotle was enabled to collect the writings of his predecessors and contemporaries and to bring together what was probably the first great library in ancient times. In that collection were many books now irretrievably lost, works on philosophy, physiology, botany and other branches of nature-study, which Aristotle put to good use in his study of natural phenomena, as is evident from his allusions to them in his own writings. Besides, Aristotle was an indefatigable investigator of facts in every department of knowledge. There were no limits to

his interest. Sea and land, mountain, river and forest, the deserts beyond the Euxine Sea and the busy marts of trade along the Mediterranean, were all teeming with phenomena that held an interest for him. He could not personally investigate them all. He could talk with the deepsea fishermen, learn the secrets of their craft and listen to their description of the wonderful creatures that inhabit the ocean's depths; he could frequent the marketplace and the slaughterhouse of the cities which he visited and see for himself the structure of various animals. But the horizon of his field was immeasurably widened when, as we learn, his royal patron and pupil decreed that imperial gamekeepers and foresters, governors of provinces and rulers of cities, captains of the royal fleet, and officers of the army of conquest should supply the scientist with material, and conduct investigations along the lines which he suggested. It was only by these means that one man could gather together that immense mass of facts about nature in all its phases which we find recorded in the Aristotelian works on nature and on living things. Thus the relation of master and pupil in the case of these two, each of whom was, so to speak, supreme in his own line of excellence, resulted in benefits for both and redounded to the advantage of science and the advancement of knowledge.

When Alexander was twenty years old he succeeded to the throne of Macedonia. Two years later, that is, in 334, he set out for his famous Asiatic campaign. Thereupon, Aristotle returned to Athens, where he opened a school of his own, and where, for a time he enjoyed the full measure of his pupil's friendship and generosity. A favor conferred on a friend of his was the occasion of a coolness which ended in Aristotle's unmerited disgrace in the eyes of the royal patron. The friend was a certain Callisthenes, whom the philosopher recommended to the king as a courtier. Callisthenes was one of those persons who imagine that in order to be honest it is necessary to be rude of speech and blunt in manner. He had been warned by Aristotle in a line from Homer,

> "Swift is the fate, my child, such words as thine bespeak."
>
> *Il.* xviii, 95.

The man was obstinate as well as rough, and his disregard for the forms of court etiquette brought down on him the suspicion of being implicated in a conspiracy against the king. How far he may have been guilty we cannot determine. In any case, his punishment involved the loss by Aristotle of all the favor he had enjoyed at the Macedonian court.

Meanwhile, Aristotle was quietly teaching his classes in philosophy at Athens. He chose for his place of meeting a grove near the gymnasium of Apollo the Lyceian. There, in the shaded walks, he taught, while he and his disciples sauntered up and down. This is the origin of the name *Peripatetic,* by which his school is known. Another name for the school is Lyceum, because, as has just been said, it met near the building sacred to the Lyceian Apollo. In the forenoon he received only his more intimate friends and advanced students, whom he addressed in more technical style and on more abstruse topics. In the afternoon he admitted a more general class of hearers, and his discourse to them was naturally in more popular style and treated the less difficult subjects. His writings, as we shall learn later, fall into this same twofold division, although, unfortunately all his more popular discourses are lost. The success of these meetings provoked jealousy among Aristotle's rivals. For, even philosophers can be jealous of one another. It was easy to find a peg on which to hang accusations. The Macedonian party was unpopular at Athens, where the voice of Demosthenes was still vibrating in his fervent efforts to fan the dying embers of patriotism into a flame of revolt. Aristotle was identified with the Macedonian party. Still, although it must have been known that he and Alexander were friends no longer, such was the magic of the conqueror's name that so long as he lived no one dared openly to attack his former teacher. When Alexander died in 323 B. C. the storm broke loose, the charge of impiety was levelled against Aristotle, and, referring to the fate of Socrates, he remarked that he would not allow the Athenians to offend a second time against philosophy. Accordingly, yielding to the storm of opposition, he left the city and retired to a country house of

his at Chalcis in Euboea, where he died, the following year, 322 B. C. The story that he committed suicide, "because he could not explain the tides" is, for many reasons, unworthy of credence. It is altogether likely that he died of a disease of the stomach from which he had suffered for many years.

In appearance, if tradition is to be relied on, Aristotle fell far short of the Greek ideal of physical perfection. His head was rather below than above the normal in point of size, and his whole body was excessively slender. His eyes were small and, as we should say, ferret-like in the rapidity with which they moved, an index, possibly of the ceaselessly inquisitive mind of the man. His voice was feeble and hesitating: in a word, his whole personality was lacking in what we nowadays call impressiveness. His health was infirm, and sustained, we are told, by means of the extraordinary skill in medicine which was one of his characteristics. These items are matters of tradition merely, and should, as in all such cases, be accepted with caution. When, however, we come to the moral picture handed down to us, we have need of more than caution. As represented by his friends, he was ideally perfect, a pagan saint; as pictured by his foes, he was the impersonation of all that is unlovable in human nature. The truth lies somewhere between these two. If we abandon tradition and turn to the writings of Aristotle, if we admit as evidence his will which seems to be genuine, the fragments of his letters which have come down to us, and the treatises in which he unconsciously betrays his own inner nature, we shall be able to form a tolerably complete and reliable picture of his personal character. His nobility of nature, his loftiness of mind, his single-hearted devotion to truth, his courteousness towards his opponents, his fidelity to his friends, his kindness towards his slaves and, the unusual tenderness of his affection for his own family—all these place him among the ethically best types of human excellence, and show him to have attained, or very nearly attained, the ideal of perfection which he sketched in his treatises on morals.

A word now about Aristotle's writings. I mentioned a

moment ago two classes into which they are usually divided, and which we may call the popular and the technical. All the works that have come down to us are technical. His popular writings seem to have perished. They include *Discourses,* the loss of which cannot be too much deplored, both because they would naturally be expected to throw light on many a difficult question of interpretation, and because it is presumed that they were written in a style far more pleasing than that of the technical works. These latter are written in the most severe scientific style, are not in fact attractive at all by reason of the form, and can be studied only by him who has a compelling interest in the contents or matter. The popular works it was that warranted Cicero in speaking of " the golden stream of eloquence " in Aristotle's writings. Certainly none of the extant works deserve that description except, perhaps, some passages in the ethical treatises. Among the lost works, also is the treatise *On the Constitutions of States,* containing the constitutions of one hundred and twenty-five Greek states. Of this a portion, dealing with the constitution of Athens, was discovered in Egypt in 1891 and published that year. The circumstances of the find were, to say the least, peculiar. It was discovered in the ruins of an old farmhouse, and on one side of the papyrus were the farmer's and steward's accounts—so many loads of hay, so many bushels of grain, so many oxen or sheep—and on the other a fragment of Aristotle's work. The technical writings that have come down to us, include a great many treatises. I will mention only the most important: the *Metaphysics* in thirteen books, the work *On the Soul,* the *Physics,* the *Histories of Animals,* the *Ethics,* the *Politics* and the work *On Poetry.* These are not only important in themselves but also of great historical interest, because each of them is the first of its own line and entitles its author to be called the Founder of Metaphysics, the Founder of Psychology, etc. Unfortunately, the text is in a very imperfect condition, and I am now going to tell you the reason, before we dismiss the subject of Aristotle's writings.

Before Aristotle left Athens he was obliged to decide on a

successor to take his place as the head of his school. There were, we are told, two candidates for the position, Menedemus of Rhodes and Theophrastus of Lesbos. Unwilling to wound either of them by a pointed rejection, the philosopher called for two cups of wine, one, the wine of Rhodes, and the other, that of Lesbos, and having tasted them both, pronounced his choice, ἡδίων ὁ Λέσβιος, "the Lesbian pleases me better." In this way, Theophrastus took his master's place as head of the school. As literary heir, he succeeded, naturally, to his master's library. When he came to make his will, however, he bequeathed the books, not to his successor in the Aristotelian school, but to a certain Neleus of Scepsis, in Asia Minor. In those days, as in our own time, there were bookhunters who would stop at nothing, and, when, as in Pergamos, on which Scepsis depended politically, the bookhunter was the king himself, it was time to hide such a treasure as Aristotle's works, for sake keeping. Accordingly, Neleus, or his descendants, put them in a cellar, and there they remained for one hundred and thirty years. From Asia Minor they found their way to Athens, and thence in 84 B. C. were carried by Sulla to Rome. At Rome they were examined, the spoiled portions restored mostly by conjecture, and edited for the first time in 70 B. C. No wonder, then, that the text of these works is in a poor condition; many passages are filled in by the editor, and his conjectures as to what Aristotle should have said in the passage destroyed by dampness are not always the happiest. Besides, there are many of these works which, in whole or in part, are merely notes for lectures made either by Aristotle himself or by his pupils. Yet the whole collection is one which, in spite of these drawbacks, has had a decisive influence on the course of human thought in the Western world. So great was the genius of Aristotle that his ideas, thus inadequately expressed, imperfectly transmitted, and only partially understood, held undisputed sway in Christendom for at least five centuries and have leavened the mass of human knowledge for all time.

To characterize that genius satisfactorily one should first

study it in its antecedents and afterwards in its contemporary environment. Aristotle sums up his own and preceding generations of thinkers in such a way that unless we understand them we cannot hope to understand him. Leaving out now, the less important of his predecessors and contemporaries, there are two to whom above all others he is closely related and with whom he must be compared. I mean Plato and Socrates. In fact, these three, Socrates, Plato and Aristotle, are associated not only historically, Aristotle having been the pupil of Plato and Plato of Socrates, but also logically, it being hopeless to try to understand one without understanding the other two. This is particularly the case with Aristotle, who, coming last, is the heir to all that the others brought, and is, moreover, a spirit more complex, more comprehensive and more inclusive than either of the others.

Socrates, the educational and moral reformer, appeared at a critical moment in the history of Greek civilization. The old order had disappeared, and a new order had not yet been established. Athens had become, and was destined for a brief period to remain, the dominant city in Greece and, indeed, along the whole Mediterranean border. She had come out of her isolation as a city-state, and was not yet accustomed to her dignity and responsibility as a metropolis. Old traditional ideas were being abandoned, in the contact with strangers, and from the same contact new ideas were being introduced. The old religion was no longer venerated, the traditional ideas of morality were no longer respected, the sense of increased political prestige descended on every son of Athens and made him more self-assertive, less docile, less amenable to discipline. Then appeared the sophists, professed teachers of wisdom, who did more than any other force to upset the ancient order and bring confusion into the new. They held as a fundamental principle that we can know nothing for certain about anything, that man himself is the measure of all things, that that is the true which appears to be true, and that, consequently, that is good which seems to be good. They boasted that, by subtle reasoning by the juggling of words and the display of a certain cheap kind

of erudition, they could make the better cause appear the worse and the worse cause appear the better. Their instructions were well attended; they gathered the youth of Athens around them, and they were the kind to make the most of every advantage that thus came their way. Perhaps Socrates, Plato and Aristotle were unjust to them. This much, at least, is certain; their influence at that particular crisis in Athenian affairs was for evil rather than for good. They demoralized, both intellectually and ethically.

It was the aim of Socrates' life to offset the influence of the sophists, to thwart them in every direction and to repair as far as was feasible the evil they had done. This he hoped to accomplish in two spheres, the moral and the intellectual. In other words, he thought he had a remedy both for their skepticism in the intellectual order and for their theoretical laxity in the moral order. But he was convinced that his task was essentially one. If he could save the intellect from skepticism, he could, he thought, save the conscience from moral anarchy. "Salvation through knowledge" was his motto. Once you lay deep and firm the foundation of intellectual knowledge, you have, he would say, a solid basis for conduct. Let us see what he meant; it is worth our while, and will repay us when we try to understand his influence on Aristotle. To his way of thinking, the knowledge which most men seek is fragmentary, incomplete and, therefore, misleading. The rhetorician, the poet, the man of affairs, the tradesman—all are equally guilty in this respect. They see but one side of a thing and they imagine they know it. Let the subject be courage; the rhetorician sees its power to move an audience, the poet sees its nobility and sublimity, the statesman sees its value in public life, the tradesman feels its practical utility and, perhaps practices it more than any of the others. Even the soldier, whose specific prerogative it is, does not study its inner nature; he does not try to get a definition of it. There, says Socrates, you have the key to the whole question. Rid your mind of the notion that a partial knowledge of courage is true knowledge; try to define it, and then you know it truly. For then you

have a concept of it, that is a mental representation in which all other views and aspects of the subject are articulated, organized and vitalized. It is a good thing to know that courage is beautiful, or noble, or useful, but if that is all you know about it, the sophist will catch you in the meshes of his subtle quibbling, and before you know it you are taking true courage for false and false for true. But, if you build up in your mind a concept of courage, you know the definition of courage, you know it as it really is, and no amount of mental jugglery can betray you into taking the true for the false or the false for the true. If, now, you treat all the other moral notions in the same way, you have a sure foundation on which to build a science of morality based on principles. Before Socrates' time morality was taught; but it was taught by means of examples, by heroic types or by citation of moral maxims and proverbs. Thus, courage was inculcated by an appeal to the example of Achilles or Hector, or by quoting such ethical proverbs as "God hates a coward," "The brave die only once, the coward, fearing death, dies a thousand times," etc. Socrates first sought a definition of courage, and used that as a point of departure in moral instruction. Thus he reformed the Athenian world in regard to conduct by insisting that knowledge, true knowledge, is the foundation of all right living. We need not inquire here how far he was right and how far he was wrong. He was partly one and partly the other. Let us pass, rather to his successor, Plato and so come to the Socratic influence as it was brought to bear on Aristotle.

Plato was the dreamer, the poet, the metaphysician. What Socrates laid down as a principle of ethical reform, he extended into wider fields and applied to the problem of the nature of reality. The concept, said Socrates, is true knowledge. We know a thing truly when we can define it. Therefore, concluded Plato, the core of reality in the thing is what the concept represents, namely an ideal element, a something that is not imperfect, fragmentary, changeable, evanescent, but perfect, integral, unchangeable, eternal. What makes courage to be courage is this ideal element in it. The same is true of

justice, goodness, beauty and even of concrete things, such as plants, animals and men. There is, in each case an Idea, as Plato calls it, which, participated in some way, by the object of our experience, makes it to be what it is. There is somewhere complete, absolute, perfect, unchangeable Justice, which makes that action or this man to be just. There is, somewhere, complete, absolute, perfect, unchangeable Beauty, which, communicated, somehow, to objects here on earth, makes them to be beautiful. The "somewhere" is further defined by calling it the World of Ideas. That is a world which moves in viewless majesty above the heavens. It is the home of all that is perfect, of all that is noble, sublime and grand. There, in that world above us, there is no imperfection, no change, no decay. When we are dissatisfied, as we all sometimes are, with things as we find them in our own world, when we discover the flaw in what is beautiful, the taint in what is noble, the rift in the lute which makes the harmony of earthly happiness, we turn with relief to that other world where Beauty is flawless, nobility is without taint, and harmony complete and unmarred. Thus Plato's World of Ideas is a response to a need which the human heart has always felt, and will always feel, as is evidenced by the universal belief in a land of the ever blessed, the Golden Islands of Atlantis, the Tir-na-n'og, or land of everlasting youth, in which our Celtic forefathers believed. Moreover, Plato teaches, this World of Ideas is our original home. We dwelt there once, at least our souls did before they were cast into the prison of our bodies, in punishment for some primordial crime. In that happy existence, our souls had immediate and fully satisfying vision of the Ideas, of the eternal perfect prototypes of all things. When they fell, our souls were steeped in the river of forgetfulness so that all distinct memory of those visions was wiped out. When, now, we see in the world around us the feeble imitations of those Ideas, when we see a just action or a just man, when we behold a beautiful scene or listen to a sweet strain of music, there comes over us a memory of the original Justice and the original Beauty which we saw long ago. And it is almost certain that

our first recollection will be the recollection of Beauty; for of all the Ideas that is the one that shines out most strikingly in the imitation of it. "A thing of beauty is a joy forever." An action may be just, a person may be good, and we pass them by unnoticed. But let a thing be beautiful, and we all perceive at once that it is beautiful. Therefore, says Plato, the recollection of our vision of Ideas begins with our appreciation of the beautiful; the love of the beautiful is the beginning of all philosophy, for philosophy is the quest of the knowledge of Ideas.

You see now to what an extent Plato was a poet and a dreamer. He wraps his thoughts in myth and allegory, and tries by the persuasive beauty of the picture he draws to lift us up from the sordid cares of this material world to a contemplation of the spiritual truth and beauty in the perfect world above us. There was something grim, determined, even highanded about Socrates, the reformer. He would stop you in the street and compel you to listen, and if, like Alcibiades, you felt yourself chained to the spot, and feared "to grow old sitting at his feet," it is because of the earnestness which lends burning eloquence to his words. Plato's method is different. He does not believe in throttling an acquaintance and forcing him to become a disciple. He would rather lead you than drive you. He throws around your soul the subtle silken filaments of his allegory; sirenlike he lures you by the sweet harmony of his style and the music of his thoughts until, if you do not agree with him, you would at least wish to agree with him, and if you decline to follow, it is with a sigh of regret that you stay your steps and redescend to solid earth. He is more concerned to please you and console you than he is to convince you. In fact, he sometimes wishes not to convince you. He would be disappointed if you took him seriously. For there is a subtle irony in many of his arguments, and you must be on your guard against it. He is, therefore, a genius "at once ironical, dramatic, allegorical," and we may add anagogical, by which I mean that his chief concern is to lift us to a higher viewpoint from which we may contemplate without

sorrow or despair the shortcomings, the imperfections, the disappointments and disasters which come into our lives from the waywardness and the sordidness of the world in which we live.

If Socrates is the reformer, rough, earnest, grimly determined, and Plato is the poet, ironical at times, dramatic, allegorical, and always sweetly persuasive in the direction of better things, Aristotle is the cold, calm, matter of fact scientist, a genius, as Newman says, "curious, fertile, penetrating, analytical." He has none of the rugged earnestness of Socrates; he lacks the poetic fire of Plato; he takes for granted that we desire to know, that we share his grand and comprehensive curiosity, and he tries to satisfy that craving in us. He does not compel us, as Socrates would; neither does he take the trouble to persuade us, as Plato does; he is content with convincing us, since he knows that we are endowed with minds open to conviction. Thus, he does not trace the beginning of philosophy to our love of the beautiful; he ascribes it to a certain inquisitiveness which, as he says in the opening sentence of his *Metaphysics,* is common to all men. "Knowledge for the sake of conduct" was the motto of Socrates, the reformer. "Knowledge for the sake of the higher life of the spirit" was the motto of Plato the poet and metaphysician; "Knowledge for its own sake" is the supreme principle with Aristotle. Socrates sought to reform human conduct; Plato tried to reconstruct human life on a spiritual basis. Aristotle was content to reorganize human knowledge on the basis of science. Socrates relied on his earnestness; Plato derived his power from his aspiration and inspiration; Aristotle sought to succeed by definiteness and systematization.

There was, then, in these three great men a difference of temperament which was fundamental. There was also a difference in their conceptions of their own lifework. There was even a difference in their ideas of the scope and aim of philosophy. Nevertheless, there is a thread of historical continuity and, I might even say, of logical consecutiveness running through the succession of their systems of thought. We have seen how Plato depended on Socrates and at the same time

advanced beyond Socratic concepts to his theory of Ideas. In like manner Aristotle depended on Plato, and improved on the Platonic explanation of reality. The Concept is a universal representation in the mind. Let us describe the work of Socrates by saying that, in opposition to the sophists, he established the universal as the basis of knowledge and conduct. Plato's Ideas are also universal. But they not only serve as a basis of knowledge and as ideals of conduct; they also exist by themselves in the world above us and enter somehow into things in the world around us, making those things to be what they are. Aristotle accepts the universal as an acquisition, so to speak, already acknowledged. He does not need to fight over again the battles won by Socrates. Furthermore, he agrees with Plato that the universal has a metaphysical application; in other words, that it is a constituent of the reality of things. But here, he parts company with his master. The universal is not an ideal in a world above us: it is an essence in the world around us. There is, if you will, a world of universal forms of things, there is Justice as well as just actions, there is Goodness as well as good deeds, there is Beauty as well as beautiful things, there is Humanity as well as human beings. But these universals are essences in the things which we experience; they are not separate forms existing in a world of their own. For Aristotle the Platonic world of Ideas is beautiful (no one can fail to pay it that tribute); for him, as for most of us, it is persuasive, attractive, consoling. But, he thinks, it is unreal. There is no proof that it exists. Nay more, there is no need of its existence; for the forces, if we may so call them, which are supposed to exist there, really exist in the world around us; if we could only convince ourselves that they are there, we can have, without believing in the Platonic world, all the advantages that such a belief would confer. You remember how in the school of Athens, Rafael makes Plato and Aristotle to be the central figures in that masterly grouping of the ancient philosophers. Plato, the idealist, the dreamer of beautiful dreams, points upward to the world of better and happier existence, where we once dwelt, and to which by philosophy we can once more return. Aris-

totle with extended palm seems at once to check the enthusiasm of Plato and to indicate by his gesture that the world which Plato seeks above us is around us and beneath us. Volumes could not describe more accurately the difference in the fundamental tenets of the two philosophers. It is a difference which was temperamental as well as logical, reaching down into the abysmal depths of genius in both cases. It is a difference which is, so to speak, structural, reaching out in the two systems into every branch of philosophy and every department of science.

Resuming, now, what has been said about the relations of these three men to one another in the region of thought, let us try to understand clearly the technical terms used. By *Concept* I mean a universal, as distinct from a particular, or fragmentary, representation of a thing in the individual mind. It is such a representation as is expressed by the definition of a thing. If I were to draw a triangle on a blackboard before you, your mental image of that would not be a concept, but a percept. But you know what a triangle in general is; you can define a triangle by saying that it is a figure having three sides. The mental image corresponding to that is a Concept. Now, that is as far as Socrates went. He did a good deal when he brought us to the point where, realizing that we can attain such mental images, we have nothing to fear from the sophist or the skeptic. By *Idea* (always with a *capital I*) I understand a form, or prototype, according to which things are made—perhaps *ideal* would be a better word than *Idea* here—which exists in a perfect world above us, and is somehow also in the world around us, participated, fragmented and in a sense debased by its union with matter, but always performing a metaphysical function, making things to be what they are. By *Essence* I understand also a form, universal like the concept and the Idea, existing, not apart from things, but in them, and like the Idea making them to be what they are. *Concept, Idea, Essence;* these are the three words which concisely but accurately sum up the work of Socrates, Plato and Aristotle, and show how each one stands related to the others. Aristotle, coming last, should have profited by what his prede-

cessors had achieved. He did so; and his formula, *Essence,* is consequently, more complex than the other two, embodying, as it does, what is in them, and adding, as it certainly does also, something peculiarly Aristotelian.

The peculiarly Aristotelian element will be studied later, as to content in logic, in natural science, in metaphysics, in psychology, in ethics, in art, in the theory of the state. Here we shall be satisfied with describing its spirit. And that spirit is, in a word, the purely scientific. If the philosophers of all time were to be classified as apostles of warmth and apostles of light, Plato would be preëminently the type of those who bring to philosophy the fire of poetic, and almost prophetic, inspiration. Aristotle would be just as preëminently the type of those who illumine. Plato's philosophy is the furnace in which human life is passed through the purifying flames and freed from all the dross of passion and matter, until nothing but the pure gold of spiritual sentiment remains. Aristotle's philosophy is like a searchlight that is turned successively into every department of human experience, into every nook and cranny of the world in which we live, revealing the unpleasant as well as the pleasant, the unlovely as well as the beautiful, the passionate as well as the pure, the material as well as the spiritual, the sordid, the imperfect, the diseased as well as the noble, the perfect and the healthy. And in all the revolving of this merciless light, and in all the surprise, the pain, the disappointment, which, as human beings, we experience when we follow those penetrating rays, there is one principle which, to Aristotle's way of thinking, justifies everything, the principle, namely, that knowledge is always and everywhere better than ignorance, that the highest activity of the soul is reason, and that the endeavor to see things as they really are is the noblest pursuit in which a human being can engage. How far this is true, and how far this view of knowledge is justifiable, and, on the other hand how far it is untrue and unjustifiable, is proved by the influence for good and evil which Aristotle exerted on those who came after him. That, however, will be the subject of another study.

William Turner.

THE POETIC CREED OF FRANCIS THOMPSON.

All great poetry, in the words of Matthew Arnold, is "a criticism of life." Whatever be the truth of the test, the poems of Francis Thompson do not fail when tried by this touchstone. Their keynote is to be sought in some words of the essay on Shelley: "With many the religion of beauty must always be a passion and a power; it is only evil when divorced from the worship of the Primal Beauty." They deal, then, with the problem whether the aesthetic sense suffices to discover the true meaning of life, how it may be disciplined and touched to its finest issues. In this respect they recall the theme of Pater's "Marius the Epicurean" who, through the strayings of a restless sense of beauty, kept the whiteness of his soul and attained to the Vision Beautiful. Of such an ordeal *The Hound of Heaven* is a touching record. It describes the ascent of love through material objects to God. The sense of flight through infinite spaces, the ardor of pursuit and hurry of avoidance until the bourne is reached in "the hid battlements of eternity," are conveyed inimitably in the speed and impulse of matchless verse. The passion for beauty, not satisfied with love of Nature or of creature, gradually becomes spiritualized and seeks its proper object in God. Such is the conclusion at which the poet arrives in his verse as in his life, the theme on which his poems are but a commentary.

One of the stages of his ascent to the divine was through his love of Nature. He loves it with an affection as passionate and personal as Keats' or Shelley's, rather than with the austere cult of Wordsworth. To him it is a living thing with whom he joys and sorrows in turn. With the abandon of a lover, he colors it with the changing hues of his own fancies, and shapes it with his varying thought:

> "What wild Dionysia, I, young Bacchanal,
> Danced in thy lap!. . . .
> I brake through thy doors of sunset,

Ran before the hooves of sunrise,
Shook thy matron tresses down in fancies
Wild and wilful
As a poet's hand could twine them;
Caught in my fantasy's crystal chalice
The Bow, as its cataract of colors
Flashed to the downward."

It is peopled by bright beings (such as the Greeks loved to fancy) whom he sees again, as in some "renascence of wonder," with fresh undimmed eyes, and senses still virgin. He addresses them with a regret as poignant as Wordsworth's for their passing:

"Must ye fade—
O old essential candours, ye who made
The earth a living and a radiant thing—
And leave her corpse in our strained, cheated arms!"

Yet how vital these nature-presences were may be judged from their fresh renewal in Thompson's verse. How subtly for instance a stormy sea is suggested in the exquisite lines:

"The Nereid tip-toe on the scud o' the surge
With whistling tresses dank athwart her face
And all her figure poised in lithe, Circean grace."

or the peeping forest life in the picture of

"The Dryad *at timid gaze by the wood-side*"

how he evokes

"The silver-stoled damsels of the sea,
Or lake, or fount, or stream.
. . . . . .
The glimmering shapes of its dim-tressèd daughters."

Such glimpses of a dream-world beneath the sea recall inevitably Shelley and Walter Savage Landor. Like them, Thompson reveals to us the viewless creatures of the elements, denizens of earth, air, and water, the spirits of the seasons, and interprets Nature's changes in terms of their moods. Thus "A Corymbus for Autumn" represents it as a lusty

maiden, a Bacchante scattering with riotous largesse all the falling wealth of the year. Similarly he shows us, with a feeling of human pity,

> "the maidens of the mist
> Clinging the necks of the unheeding hills."

He is strangely divided between the pagan and Christian manner of envisaging Nature. The splendid "Ode to the Setting Sun," which is a presentation of both, may be likened to the overture of "Tannhaüser." It is an expression in a subtler measure and a more aërial scale of the pagan and the Christian *motif*. The pagan view yields completely in the "Orient Ode," to the vision of the whole earth swung like a thurible before "the embannered Throne." So the seasons have their ritual, the dawn and day-fall their special rubrics. The heavens declare to him the glory of God. He sees Him figured in the blood-red sunset, in the white ministry of the frost and snow in

> "The moving waters at their priest-like task
> Of pure ablution round earth's human shores."

To this delight in Nature he adds a humanity as ardent as Charles Lamb's. He is rooted by a thousand fibres to the kindly earth: his poems are saturated with this human quality. To children he has dedicated a whole chaplet of verse which recalls the musical titles of the seventeenth century: "To Monica thought dying," "The Making of Viola" and *Sister Songs* with their burthen "For Singing to Sylvia." They breathe innocence and the Spring. And he approaches them with such tender delicacy for their flower-like bloom that his treatment of "The Child-Woman" deserves Landor's self-tribute:

> "The ever-sacred cup
> Of the pure lily hath between my hands
> Felt safe, unsoiled, nor lost one grain of gold."

They are the earthly links which connect him most nearly with heaven. So his brief meeting and parting with the child

"Daisy" by the sea-shore was for him an incident full of the pathos of "the whole woeful heart of things." Readers will remember that other incident of one of his homeless nights in London when he was befriended by a waif

> "A child, ... a spring-flower; but a flower
> Fallen from the budded coronal of Spring,
> And through the city streets blown withering."

and the utter fervor of humanity which throbs in his after-yearning for

> "The healing harms
> And whitest witchery, a-lurk in that
> Authentic cestus of two girdling arms."

In general his love for his fellows is sublimated and refined, redeemed from the animal camaraderie of Whitman. He has interest only for "the human face *divine*." All earthly beauty is a symbol; the fair shows of sense but broken lights of the divine—the keys, he loved to say, on which God modulates through the universe. Thus he writes of the lady of "Her Portrait,"

> "God laid his fingers on the ivories
> Of her pure members as on smoothèd keys,
> And there out-breathèd her spirit's harmonies."

It is interesting to compare the poem of this Catholic mystic with the pagan mysticism of Shelley's "Epipsychidion." How far removed are both from the frankly sensual inspiration of Swinburne's "Dolores" and "Laus Veneris"!

Francis Thompson's poetry has been called "sacramental." There is no other word to express its peculiar quality. To him all finite things are symbols, their beauty but a revelation of the unseen, a means by which it becomes visible to us "as in a glass darkly." It is his very realization of natural loveliness which leads him to God, the Author of it all. He has learned the law of its caducity:

> "Whatso looks lovelily
> Is but the rainbow on life's weeping rain."

and, with Keats and Herrick, knows only too well the fleeting character of

> "Beauty that must die:
> And Joy whose hand is ever at his lips
> Bidding adieu; and aching Pleasure nigh
> Turning to poison while the bee-mouth sips."

He must needs pass through it and beyond to cry with St. Augustine: "Thou hast made us for Thyself, O Lord, and our hearts are restless till they rest in Thee." Thus he learns the lesson of renunciation, and ascetism becomes his gospel. His bright Hellenism had availed nothing for "earth with heavy griefs so overwhelmed." "The Anthem of Earth" is like some grand organ voluntary on this sombre theme. It is Hamlet's dark vision of mortality: *pulvis et umbra sumus.* Yet this problem of evil only serves to make possible a synthesis which embraces and resolves all human sorrow and affection in a higher unity. The return is effected by a deeper consideration of life and mortality which finds "admirable the manner of our corruption as of our health." In "The Mistress of Vision" and other poems he teaches us, in common with all the great mystics, the amenities of the Cross. The poet, become anchorite, has penetrated its inwardness:

> "The essence of all suffering which is joy."

and refers it to the mercy of God. For it is naught but 'Shade of Thy Hand outstretched caressingly.' Such is the goal of his quest, the spiritual note on which he closes. Thus his poems may be called, in an application truer than Swinburne intended,

> "the golden book of spirit and of sense,
> The Holy Writ of Beauty."

FLORENCE MOYNIHAN.

SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC QUESTIONS IN THE EARLY CHURCH.

It is futile to hope to find in the writings of the early Christian authors the delineation of any scheme of life expressed in terms of modern economic science. At the time there was not only no technical language of economics but profound ignorance of the principles and workings of economic forces. This ignorance was universal. The utter failure of the highly trained officials of the Roman Imperial administration to grasp the significance of economic law brings on them the ridicule of modern students of the subject. Schiller is never tired pointing out how frequently they made the fatal mistake of attempting to relieve the fiscal necessities of the state by the fatal expedient of debasing the coinage.[1] When remedial legislation was resorted to, it arose from no conception of the magnitude of the economic heresy which had been committed, but from sad experience of the evils which had resulted therefrom.

Economic forces, however, operate and make themselves felt as potent factors in life independently of any knowledge or investigation of their character. Thus, while the early Christian writers may offer no light on the scientific side of economic questions, they, as exponents of the Christian scheme of life, show what attitude was taken towards the industrial and commercial activities of their time. Their position was invariably that of moralists, not economists. When they expressed themselves it was to oppose injustice or to combat ideas which conflicted with the Christian concept of duty and destiny. Their unsparing denunciation of evil, however, and their insistance on the practice of Christian virtue placed them in a position of constant antagonism to certain conditions which could not be changed without affecting the social and economic

[1] *Geschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit*, Vol. I, pp. 361, 380, 752, 770, 843.

life of the community. They preached no new social doctrines but they waged a determined propaganda against the vices inherent in the slave system, against the laziness and contempt for labor among the masses, against the luxury and sensuality in the lives of the wealthy, against usury, against materialism, etc., all of which were regarded as obstacles to the attainment of Christian perfection.

The position of the early Christian teachers towards matters of an economic character offers at the outset one general source of difficulty which may be taken as the root of all the misunderstanding which exists regarding their teaching. To properly interpret their words in this as well as in all matters bearing on conduct, a sharp distinction must be made between what is laid down as of *precept* and what is inculcated as being merely of *counsel*. This distinction is all the more pertinent in the present case because the things of counsel are nearly always intended to promote individual perfection and rarely meant for the community at large. Thus the high regard in which celibacy is held in the Church does not conflict in any way with her equally high and well defined historical attitude towards matrimony.

The failure of many writers to grasp the significance of this necessary distinction has led to much confusion of thought at the present time. This, however, is not surprising because, even in the early church, the lack of perception between what was purely ascetical and what was of general application led to irregularities of thought and conduct which called forth sharp denunciation from Christian writers and frequently the condemnation of the Church. Because of their rigorism and their inculcation of a fantastic scheme of life, the Montanists laid the foundation for their separation from the general body of the faithful. In the same manner the anti-social teachings of the Gnostics, especially in regard to marriage and property, marked them off as completely from the orthodox Christians as did their peculiar doctrines on Dualism.

So widely and with such little discretion were these Gnostic doctrines preached that they became a positive obstacle to the

spread of Christianity and a source of anguish to many zealous Christians. Clement of Alexandria felt himself called on to write a special treatise which he entitled "What Rich Man shall be Saved?" to show that riches were not necessarily a bar to the attainment of eternal happiness. The purpose of the work was to reassure those Christians who did not feel themselves capable of observing the ascetic rigors which were said to be the true exposition of Christian conduct and morality.

Misapprehensions of a similar character are found to-day. Statements of the early Christian writers are torn from their context, and expressions of hostility to riches and property and pleasures resting purely on spiritual grounds are used as a basis for the inference that the possession of property or wealth was held to be incompatible with true Christianity. Other statements bearing on the duty of the wealthy towards their weaker and less fortunate brethren are frequently taken to mean that in the minds of these authors fraternal charity was synonymous with communism. As a matter of fact the Christian teachers seldom troubled themselves about purely temporal things. They were preachers who, weighing the present life against the life to come, naturally spoke with harshness of wealth and power and earthly attachments which might hinder men from attaining their real destiny, eternal happiness.

Hence denunciation of wealth and power cannot place the early Christians in the position of desiring the destruction of the old and the establishment of new economic conditions. Their insistence that perfection could be attained only by abandoning all undue attachment to material things cannot be made to apply to any social scheme in preference to others. What was preached in the highly centralized and absolutistic Empire of Rome with its gross poverty and tremendous riches would be equally valid under a communistic régime or in any form of society where the indulgence of physical cravings might stifle spiritual aspirations.

Historic considerations must also at times be borne in mind in order to understand some statements of the early Christian

writers on the subject of wealth and property. In many cases possession was acquired or accompanied by violation of the moral law. Where such was the case the Christian moralists were not sparing in their denunciations.

No analysis or discussion of the social teaching of the early Christians can offer satisfactory results which does not take into account their general teaching on human life and destiny. In their minds the attainment of eternal happiness was the paramount object of all human activity. Man had been estranged from God by sin, and to be reinstated in the divine favor and friendship was an object which transcended every other consideration. Salvation and future happiness threw all other problems into the background. The visible and the earthly lost all significance when compared with the invisible and supernatural. The ceaseless and bitter struggles in this world had no meaning except in so far as they were related with eternal happiness or eternal woe.

Such beliefs could not fail to affect profoundly their views on all the relations of life. But they as well as their contemporaries were entirely lacking in the historic spirit. Paganism and profane philosophy had never attained to the concept of a world-history. And at a time when the very existence of the Church was at stake, when all the faith of the Christians was required to enable them to bear the ills of life, and when their ranks were recruited largely from the poor and ignorant, it is not natural to expect that they should concern themselves about formulating theories of the ideal state. Christianity, with its wonderful power for the regeneration of society, was moulding and forming their lives and through them was influencing their whole environment, but they were themselves, perhaps, not conscious of the magnitude of the transformation which was taking place. Their writings, called forth by special exigencies, were designed as a general rule to break down the force of pagan opposition rather than to give a systematic exposition of the Christian concept of life in all its bearings. The consciousness of the world mission and social values of Christianity worked itself out gradually, but found no com-

plete expression until St. Augustine expounded his Philosophy of History in the *De Civitate Dei.*

The problems connected with organized society and especially in the form which these have assumed in the hands of modern investigators did not present themselves to the minds of the early Christians. The truths of Biology or History as affecting social theory did not help to mould their opinions and they had no conception of the purely technical meaning attached to such questions as Capital and Labor, The Inter-racial Struggle for Existence, the Principle of Population, the Force of Competition or the evils and advantages of Cosmopolitanism.

A distinct advantage however accrues to their position from the fact that they viewed the world and its activities from the standpoint of religion. In this way they escaped the one-sidedness which ignores the action and interaction of different spheres of effort. The universal application of Christian teaching to all activity either of the individual or the community compelled them to view life in all its phases, and thus saved them from the danger of narrowness.

Taking religion as the basis of all their ideas concerning the relation of man to his physical environment the early Christians looked on the possessor as merely the steward of earthly goods. For these he was responsible to God the Creator who was the supreme Lord and Master. In themselves, worldly gifts were not an end but a means to the sanctification of the soul through proper use and the service of one's neighbor. "For whatever we receive rightly and honorably," says Origen, "we receive from God, and by His Providence, as ripe fruits and the corn which strengtheneth man's heart, and the pleasant vine, and wine which rejoiceth the heart of man. And moreover the fruit of the olive tree, to make his face to shine, we have from the Providence of God." [2]

[2] *Contra Celsum*, VIII, 67. It is difficult to understand how Brentano can take this doctrine of the Fathers to mean that they regarded all property as a "verdammenswerte Usurpation." "Die wirtschaftlichen Lehren des Christlichen Alterthums." *Sitzungsberichte der Bayer. Akademie. Philos-philol, und Histor. Classe*, 1902, p. 159.

This belief which finds the meaning of life, not in its relation to its environment, but in its bearing on ultimate union with God, was revolutionary of old Greek methods of thought but not necessarily productive of a new social order. It is true that the sense of responsibility to the Creator for the use made of His gifts would tend to remove much of the inequality and injustice which had prevailed, but this could be brought about without changing essentially the character of the social structure. Not the possession of earthly goods but the use made of them was the question of paramount importance.

Not less striking was the view taken of man's place in organised society. Here too the supernatural destiny of man was taken as the measure of his relations to his fellows, and because all were sharers in the same high destiny all were considered equal. The true character of this equality is most fully discussed by Lactantius who placed justice at the basis of the perfect life. "Although justice embraces all the virtues together, yet there are two, the chief of all, which cannot be torn asunder and separated from it—piety and equity." [3] Explaining piety to be nothing more than knowing and worshipping God he expounded his views of Equity "The other part of justice therefore is equity; and it is plain that I am not speaking of the equity of judging well, though this also is praiseworthy in a just man, but of making himself equal to others which Cicero calls equability. For God, who produces and gives breath to men, willed that all should be equal, that is, equally matched. He has imposed on all the same conditions of living. He has produced all to wisdom; He has promised immortality to all; no one is cut off from His heavenly benefits. For He distributes to all alike His one light, sends forth His fountains to all, supplies food, and gives the most pleasant rest of sleep; so He bestows on all equity and virtue. In His sight no one is a slave, no one a master; for if all have the same Father by an equal right we are all children." [4] The same was the view of Cyprian. "You share the same lot in respect of being born,

[3] *Divine Institutes*, v. 15. [4] *Ibid.*

the same condition in respect of dying; you have like bodily substance and a common order of souls, you come into this world of ours and depart from it after a time with equal rights." [5]

In the opinion of Lactantius "neither the Romans nor the Greeks could possess justice, because they had men differing from one another by many degrees, from the poor to the rich, from the humble to the powerful; in short, from private persons to the highest authorities of kings." Even though similar conditions might exist among the Christians, he shows how there could be no real inequality among them. "Some one will say, are there not among you some poor and others rich, some servants and others masters? Is there not some difference between individuals? There is none; nor is there any other cause why we mutually bestow upon each other the name of brethren, except that we believe ourselves to be equal. For since we measure all things not by the body but by the spirit, although the condition of bodies is different, yet we have no servants, but we both regard and speak of them as brothers in spirit, in religion as fellow servants." [6]

In the words *Omnia humana non corpore, sed spiritu metimur* is to be found the real meaning of the early Christian doctrine of equality. Social distinctions were merely relative, and material prosperity counted for little when viewed from this standpoint.

The idea of the equality of men was associated with another of equal importance, Fraternity, which also rested on a religious basis. Lactantius, expounding at length this doctrine, says: "But the change of the age and the expulsion of justice is to be deemed nothing else than the laying aside of divine religion, which alone effects that man should esteem man dear, and should know that he is bound to him by the tie of brotherhood, since God is alike a Father to all, so as to share the bounties of the common God and Father with those who do not possess

[5] *Ad Demetrianum*, 8.

[6] *Divine Institutes*, v. 16. See also Minucius Felix, *Oct.*, XXXVIII, *Omnes pari sorte nascimur; sola virtute distinguimur.*

them; to injure no one, to oppress no one, not to close his door against a stranger, not his ear against a suppliant, but to be bountiful, beneficient and liberal. This truly is justice and this is the golden age." [7] Pursuing this idea that justice is the centre of all virtue, he shows the duty of loving God necessarily implies love of one's neighbor. "The first office of justice is to be united with God, the second with man. But the former is called religion; the second is named mercy or kindness; which virtue is peculiar to the just and to the worshippers of God, because this alone compromises the principle of common life." [8] How this idea for fraternity and kindness to others is rooted in the very nature of men he points out by showing their comparative defencelessness as compared to other animals. "But because He made him naked and weak that He might rather furnish him with wisdom. He gave him besides other things this feeling of kindness; so that man should protect, love and cherish man and both receive and afford assistance against all dangers. Therefore, kindness is the greatest bond of human society; and he who has broken this is to be deemed impious and a parricide." [9] Such doctrines are of course unintelligible and meaningless unless viewed in connection with the general law of charity which bound men to God and through Him to one another.

As a natural result of this doctrine that men are equal and that they are brothers, there follows that other doctrine of the solidarity of the human race, a theory of the entire interdependence of all men, which first found practical expression in the writings of the early Christians and by which they may be said to have anticipated by centuries the conclusions of students of anthropology and history. "For," says Lactantius, "if we all derive our origin from one man whom God created, we are plainly of one blood." [10] For mutual protection men have been given this affection of pity; [11] as in all other cases the motive for the exercise of this affection comes from religion; for:

[7] *Divine Institutes*, v. 6.
[8] *Ibid.*
[9] *Ibid.*, vi, 10.
[10] *Divine Institutes*, vi. 10.
[11] *Divine Institutes*, iii, 23.

" whatever a man has bestowed upon another hoping for no advantage from him, he really bestows upon himself for he will receive a reward from God." [12] The obligations involved in this relation of solidarity none could escape, " for God since He is kind, wished man to be a social animal." [13]

From the beginning the practice of the Christians was in conformity with this doctrine and this ideal of social conditions, " Thou shalt not turn away from him that is in want, but thou shalt share all things with thy brother, and shalt not say that they are thine own, for if ye are partakers in that which is immortal how much more in things which are mortal." [14]

How far the early Christians, notwithstanding their insistance on the equality of men, were from committing themselves to any system of collectivism is clear from the stress which was constantly laid upon the worth of the individual. Individualism is the very essence of their moral teaching, laying, as it does, all weight upon the question of salvation which can be attained only through individual effort. In addition to insisting on the independent worth of the individual they were equally vigorous in urging both by word and practice the objectionableness of Communism. The classic theory of Communism in antiquity was that of Plato. Lactantius states it as follows: " Under the teaching of Socrates it did not escape the notice of Plato, that the force of justice consists in equality, since all are born in an equal condition. Therefore (he says) they must have nothing private or their own: but that they may be equal, as the method of justice requires, they must possess all things in common." [15]

Conceding in the beginning of his argument that Communism might be endured if there was question only of money, he shows how repugnant it is to the Christian mind because it involves the hideous doctrine of free-love, because it destroys family life and reduces human society to the level of the herds and beasts. In essence it is destructive of the very object it sets out to attain " because there is no more violent cause of

[12] *Ibid*, VI, 12.
[13] *Ibid.*, VI, 10.
[14] *Didache*, IV, 8.
[15] *Divine Institutes*, III, 21.

discord than the desire of one woman by many men." The practical results of attempting to impose such a scheme on society would be to introduce adulteries and lusts, to remove temperance and chastity and modesty and frugality "which has no existence when there is no property of one's own." Turning to the economic side of the question he argues: "The ownership of property contains the materials both of vices and of virtues, but a community of goods contains nothing else than the licentiousness of vices." That the scheme was visionary and impracticable was evidenced to his mind by the fact "that no nation has existed in the world so foolish or so vain as to live in this manner." The true idea of equality, the real communism, is to be found "by taking away not marriage and wealth but arrogance, pride and haughtiness, that those who are powerful and lifted upon high may know they are on a level even with the neediest." [16] These express statements coupled with the fact that among the early Christians no one dreamt of regarding the Church as a communistic society, show that their social ideals did not extend to collectivism or the abolition of private property.

On this latter question of private property and the cognate subject of riches, the mind of the early Christians finds such full and complete expression that their words on this matter are a real touchstone to their concept of social relations. The only one of the early writers who devoted a special treatise to the subject was, as has been said, Clement of Alexandria. In the work, "What Rich Man shall be Saved?" he combats the views of some rigorists, who, confounding use and abuse, maintained that the possession of property was incompatible with the true and real practice of a Christian life.[17] His treatment of the subject is especially valuable because he speaks not as a philosopher or economist, but as a theologian aiming to remove a misinterpretation of a Scriptural passage. (*Mark* x, 17-31.)

[16] *Divine Institute,* III, 21.

[17] See Funk, "Klemens von Alexandrien über Familie und Eigentum," *Kirchengeschichtliche Abhandlungen und Untersuchungen,* Vol. II, pp. 45 seq.

The words of Our Lord regarding the difficulty with which the rich attained salvation had been interpreted by some to mean that the possession of wealth entailed of itself exclusion from the kingdom of Heaven, and that the rich who desired salvation should accept the gospel literally and sell all they had or otherwise rid themselves of their earthly possessions. Clement refutes this interpretation by showing in the first place that the possession of riches is not in itself blameworthy or sinful. "Christ," he says, "does not, as some conceive off-hand, bid him throw away the substance he possessed, and abandon his property; but bids him banish from his soul his notions about wealth, his excitement and morbid feeling about it, the anxieties which are the thorns of existence, which choke the seed of life. For thus those who have nothing at all but are destitute and beggars for their daily bread, the poor dispersed on the streets, who know not God and God's righteousness, simply on account of their extreme want and destitution of subsistence, and lack even of the smallest things, were most blessed and most dear to God, and sole possessors of everlasting life." [18] That poverty and the renunciation of earthly possessions were enjoined upon all he considers to be contrary to many statements and facts in the words and life of our Lord. If all Christians were to abandon their property what was to be said about this command regarding the giving of alms, making friends of the mammon of iniquity, etc. "How could one give food to the hungry, and drink to the thirsty, clothe the naked and shelter the homeless, for not doing which He threatens with fire and outer darkness, if each man first divested himself of all these things." [19] To throw away riches would be to deprive ourselves of the power of aiding our neighbor; they must be regarded merely as instruments which God has placed at the disposal of mankind to aid in the pursuit of good.[20] Christ does not forbid men to be rich, but to be insatiably and unjustly rich.[21] From the moral point of view to be rich or poor, just as being handsome or ugly, is a matter of

[18] *Quis Dives*, XI.
[19] *Ibid.*, XIII.
[20] *Ibid.*, XIV.
[21] *Stromata*, III, 6.

indifference.[22] The mere casting away of wealth is not in itself meritorious: "for he who casts away worldly wealth can still be rich in the passions, even though the material for their gratification is absent, for the disposition produces its own effects, and strangles the reason, and presses it down and inflames it with inbred lusts, it is then of no advantage to him to be poor in purse while he is rich in passion." [23] Clement thus sees no incongruity between the possession of earthly goods and the practice of the Christian religion, and looks on private property as an aid rather than an obstacle to the attainment of eternal happiness.

The same doctrines are found in Origen, who, notwithstanding his iron rigorism, does not seem to consider the condition of the poor as more conducive to salvation than that of the rich. Neither riches nor poverty can save men from the temptation to sin; [24] nor do riches exclude men from heaven.[25] In fact they can be considered as a means to obtaining greater merit as in the case of rich martyrs.[26] The word "rich" in the text, "It is hard for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God," means "rich in the simplest sense as referring to the man whose mind is distracted by his wealth, and, as it were entangled with thorns, so that it brings forth no spiritual fruit, or rich in the sense of abounding in false notions." [27] Private property, in the opinion of both, is the essential condition to the maintenance of society, the necessary means of binding men together.[28]

While thus maintaining that men, without detriment to the sincerity of their faith as Christians, might hold property and enjoy riches, the early Christian writers never lost sight of the fact that the right to property meant something more than the *jus utendi et abutendi*, in the sense of being permitted to use their possessions without any sense of responsibility. The only reason why men enjoyed the good things of the world was because God by creation enabled them to do so. He made the

[22] *Quis Dives*, XVIII.
[23] *Quis Dives*, XIII.
[24] *On Prayer*, 29. 5.
[25] *Exhortation to Martyrdom*, XIV.
[26] *Ibid.*, XV.
[27] *Comm. in Matth.*, 19. 23.
[28] *Contra Celsum*, VII, 23.

world subject to them and gave them power to rule over everything under the sun.[29] Property rights thus derived did not contain the further right of allowing the fortunate possessors to live in unsocial isolation, nor to be callously indifferent to the general welfare.[30] The interests of society at large predominated over those of the individual or any group of individuals, and the welfare of mankind and the common good were more important than the special interests of any class.[31] The possession of wealth implied a divinely imposed obligation towards the poor, and even poverty was not without its obligations towards wealth. "The poor man makes intercession; a work in which he is rich, which he received from the Lord and with which he recompenses the master who helps him." [32] So strict was this obligation of assisting the poor, that it was considered improper for the wealthy to use their resources in gaining additional property as long as there were needy and helpless fellow beings in need of assistance. "Instead of lands, therefore, buy afflicted souls, according as each one is able, and visit widows and orphans, and do not overlook them, ... for to this end did the Master make you rich that you might perform these services to him." [33]

The principle of solidarity implied in this doctrine of mutual aid was eminently characteristic of Christian thought and conduct from the beginning. "A mutual sharing of kind offices," says Lactantius, "is the preservation of society." [34] "We," says Justin, speaking of converts like himself, "who valued above all things the acquisition of wealth and possessions, now bring what we have into a common stock, and communicate to every one in need." [35] That no ideas of a collectivist character

[29] Hermas, *Pastor, Mandatum*, XII, 4.

[30] Lactantius, *Divine Institutes*, VI, 12. "This is the chief and truest advantage of riches, not to use wealth for the particular pleasure of an individual, but for the welfare of many; not for one's immediate enjoyment, but for justice, which alone does not perish."

[31] Origen, *Contra Celsum*, VII, 59.

[32] Hermas, *Pastor, Similitude*, II.

[33] *Ibid., Similitude*, I.

[34] *Divine Institutes*, VI, 10.

[35] *Apol.* I. 15.

underlay this practice is clear from the fact that the voluntary character of these offerings is constantly insisted on. Irenaeus, comparing the custom of offering gifts which prevailed among the Jews with that of the Christians, says the Christians offered not as slaves but as freemen.[36] "Each of us," says Tertullian, speaking of the Christian congregation, "makes a small donation; but only if it be his pleasure, and only if he be able: for there is no compulsion; all is voluntary."[37]

The strongest argument, however, from the practice of the Christians regarding their views of the constitution of society is that which may be derived from their official recognition of a dependent class and their schemes of organized relief. In a condition of society where all are equally entitled to share in the general stock, there can be no question of rich and poor; for Communism excludes Charity. So striking, however, was the activity of the Church in this matter that it did not escape the notice of the pagans who, as Tertullian tells us, used to exclaim: Behold how they love one another;[38] and as exemplifying the idea that almsgiving was not rooted in any idea of the Church as a socialistic organization the Christians did not confine their benefactions to those within the fold. "Why do you select persons?" says Lactantius, "He is to be esteemed by you as a man, whoever it is that implores you, because he considers you a man."[39]

Though there were rich men and women in the Church, no one dreamt of depriving them of membership because of their riches. When the charge was made that the Christians were for the most part drawn from among the poor and needy, the accusation was not considered a disgrace, neither was it regarded as being distinctive of the Christians as a body.[40] In fact the existence of different classes was considered to be a necessity. "The great," says Clement of Rome, "cannot subsist without the small, nor the small without the great. There

[36] *Adv. Haer.*, IV, 18. 2.
[37] *Apol.*, Chap. 38.
[38] *Ibid.*
[39] *Divine Institutes*, VI, 11.
[40] Minucius Felix, *Octavius*, Chap. XXXVI.

is a kind of mixture in all things and thence arises mutual advantage." [41]

From this belief in the existence of classes there arose the practice of social service, the διακονία. From the very beginning the giving of charity was as indissolubly associated with the activities of the Church as was that of preaching and administering the sacraments, and for each set of duties special ministers were ordained. Thus, by her very organization, the Church may be said to have committed herself to the acknowledgement of a state of society in which there were classes, differing because of their greater or less acquisition of worldly wealth. Nothing, furthermore, is so distinctive of Christian life as the organized effort to relieve distress. In thus adopting her constitution to the requiremnts of a social condition in which there were rich and poor, and by her systematic efforts in aid of the weak and unfortunate, the Church took a decided stand against collectivism, except in so far as Christian charity voluntarily exercised is collectivist. Thus the teaching and practice of the early Christians shows how far they were from considering the Church as a society of communists, and how futile it is to consider them the forerunners of modern socialism.

Hence, though they formulated no theories of social science as such, it is possible to derive from their writings, at least in outline, the social scheme which engaged the minds of the followers of Christ in the days before Constantine. They envisaged human society as a unit bound together by faith and charity. The fundamental law of all human relations was love. Because of this bond of love each individual in the community was obligated to each other individual by mutual ties of duty and service. When the general good was at stake the rights of the individual, such as they were, were subordinate to those of the body at large, and thus in every sense modified by the idea of a community of interest. The possession of riches and property was in no way incompatible with the spirit of Christianity. Though there were dangers connected with ownership, men were not therefore bound to renounce their

[41] *Ep.* XXXVII.

possessions. Even from the moral and social standpoint, the possession of property was not without its advantages. It might be used as a means to aid in the exercise and development of certain virtues, besides being a source of allaying the distress of the helpless and the dependent. The true riches of life, however, were those which conduced to eternal happiness, and hence the goodness or evil of earthly things was always merely relative.

God is the real Lord and Master of all things earthly. He it is to whom men owe what they have: to Him must they be responsible for the use they make of the gifts, material as well as spiritual, with which He has endowed them. The true measure of right use is found in the law of charity. What has been justly acquired must be spent honestly. Hence, to desire wealth immoderately, to use it carelessly or sinfully, to see in it only a means of promoting luxury and excesses, are all in contradiction to the spirit of Christian ownership.

Because, too, of the other-worldly spirit which dominated them, the early Christians took a view of wealth and property which gives their economic and social outlook its peculiar Christian character. External things meant little, provided a man was not constrained from the service of God or the pursuit of virtue. Not the increase of wealth and easy living were the paramount object of society, but the attainment of conditions favorable to the growth of the spiritual life.

The assertion and observation of these principles was inseparable from the practice of the general maxims of Christian conduct. Though such a scheme of life may have led to confusion of thought at times, and though the social character of Christianity was slow in finding conscious expression, the seeds for social regeneration sown in the preaching of the gospel bore fruit much earlier in the lives than in the words of the faithful.

PATRICK J. HEALY.

BOOK REVIEWS.

The Life and Legend of the Lady Saint Claire: Translated from the French version, 1563, of Brother Francis Du Puis, by Charlotte Balfour. With an Introduction by Father Cuthbert, O. S. F. C. (Longmans, Green and Co., 1910), pp. xi + 154.

The Legend here presented in an English dress is a quaint sixteenth century French version of the primitive Latin biography of St. Clare usually ascribed to Thomas of Celano (1255-1261). Mrs. Balfour was well inspired when she decided to translate this version into English, for there is a beauty of diction all its own in Du Puis's rendering. What is better, her translation is exceedingly well done and in every way is worthy of the original. Besides the Legend proper, which is enhanced by valuable notes, Mrs. Balfour gives an English version of some important passages from the *Fioretti*, the *Speculum Perfectionis* and Thomas of Celano bearing on the life of St. Clare as well as of four charming letters addressed by the Saint to Princess Agnes of Bohemia, thus placing all lovers of St. Clare under an additional obligation to her. To students of the Franciscan Legend, however, Father Cuthbert's Introduction will doubtless prove the most interesting portion of the present volume. It deals with the winsome and wonderful personality of St. Clare and with her long struggle against the world's prudence to maintain the life of "Most High Poverty" which was the ideal of St. Francis. Apart from the graces of style which we are accustomed to associate with everything coming from the pen of Father Cuthbert, her treatment of the whole subject reveals the sympathetic historical insight of one who has made it peculiarly her own and is a finished piece of criticism. A most attractive feature of the volume are the illustrations. They include Collaert's well-known engravings from photographs specially taken in the British Museum and excellently reproduced. The material make-up of the book—printing, paper and binding—reflects great credit on the publishers. In every respect "The Life and Legend of the Lady Saint Clare" is a work for which

English readers of Franciscan Literature may well be grateful and for which it is reasonable to predict a wide welcome.

Fr. Paschal Robinson, O. F. M.

Bossuet et les Protestants, par E. Julien. Paris, Beauchesne et cie., 1910. 8vo., 382 pp.

The leading idea of this volume is the one so eloquently and forcibly set forth in the numerous controversial works of Bossuet, that true Christianity is to be found only in Catholicism, that Protestant principles necessarily lead to the denial of all dogma and hence to irreligion, that only in the Catholic Church does the promise of Christ's assistance have its fulfilment, so that to be a Christian in the full sense of the word is to be a Catholic.

With this idea in mind, the author expounds the Catholic notion of the Church, tradition, justification, good works, the sacraments, the sacrifice of the Mass, and veneration of the saints, at the same time contrasting and refuting the erroneous views of Protestantism. The last two chapters are given to the consideration of the moral and social consequences of Protestant principles.

There is little that is new in this work. It shows solidity without breadth of treatment. In style it is not above the average treatises of its kind. It is highly praised both by the examiner, Mgr. Loth, and by the archbishop of Rouen. Their laudatory letters form the introduction to the volume. While the book has merit, it will hardly win a name as a notable addition to French ecclesiastical literature.

Charles F. Aiken.

Orpheus et L'Evangile, par Pierre Batiffol. Paris, Gabalda et cie., 1910. 12mo. 284 pp.

Last year Mr. Solomon Reinach, Jew, scholar, and atheist, published a book entitled, *Orpheus*, in which, with much specious show of erudition mingled with many inaccuracies and unwarranted statements, he pretended to account for all religions,

Christianity included, as more or less refined outgrowths of primitive superstitions, especially of totemism and taboo restrictions. Defining religion as an assemblage of scruples hampering the exercise of free will, he sought with ill disguised hatred to bring about, if possible, the utter discrediting of the Christian religion, particularly that form of it which rejoices in the name Catholic, and which to-day is the strongest bulwark against atheism and anarchy. With the view to undermine the very foundations of Christian faith, he has devoted not a few pages to the attempt to show that what is recorded of our blessed Lord in the Gospels, Acts and Epistles, is not the testimony of eye and ear witnesses, and that consequently there is nothing in the story of Christ that merits the name of genuine history.

It is to refute this portion of Reinach's book that the Abbé Batiffol delivered eight lectures at Versailles last winter. He has now published them under the title, *Orpheus et l'évangile*. A beautiful volume it is, solid, erudite, clearly arranged, treated with a breadth of view that marks the true scholar, and written in a style that makes it a delight to read. With good taste, he rises above the plane of sharp polemics and gives a calm, dignified exposition of the grounds for accepting as truly historical the contents of the Gospels, Acts, and Pauline Epistles. After discussing in the first two lectures the much debated testimony of Josephus and the references to Christ in the teachings of the early rabbis and in the writings of Pliny and Tacitus, he treats in successive lectures of the Catholic Canon, of the value of St. Paul's testimony, of the author of Acts, whom Harnack in harmony with the traditional view has brilliantly proved to be Luke, the physician and companion of St. Paul, of the Synoptic Gospels, which he contends may be safely placed in the years 60-70 A. D., of the undoubted authenticity of Jesus' recorded sayings, of the truly historical character of the Gospel story of Jesus. *Orpheus* is rarely mentioned except in footnotes, where its inaccuracies, misstatements, and use of antiquated and discredited arguments are exposed and turned to the discomfiture of the author. Apart from its refutation of Reinach's anti-Christian theory, the book has a permanent value as perhaps the very best Catholic presentation in succinct form of the historic character of the Gospel record. The high reputation of the Abbé Batiffol as a Catholic scholar will not fail to be enhanced by this delightful and useful volume.

CHARLES F. AIKEN.

Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism, by Harold M. Wiener, M. A., LL. B. Oberlin, O., Bibliotheca Sacra Co., 1909, pp. 239. Price, $1.50.

The Essays consist of a series of investigations, with the broad result that the substantial integrity of the Pentateuch as a production of the time of Moses, is asserted. In the main, they form a critical inquiry into the principal difficulties alleged by some scholars concerning the narratives of the last four books of the Pentateuch. The first chapter contains an interesting textual study in connection with Astruc's clue to the documents in Genesis. The last chapter is devoted to a test of the Wellhausen theory.

A vast amount of critical matter is covered in the Essays, and that within a comparatively small compass. This is effected through the rather forensic style which covers the treatment. Like Wellhausen and Robertson Smith, the author has brought his case before the bar of the ordinary mind. He, however, uses some three or four critics as his chief resource, and in running his quarry to the ground, he does it too lightly for a work that aims at being a positive contribution to conservative literature.

JOSEPH A. NELSON.

Our Lord's Last Will and Testament. Thoughts on Foreign Missions—Adapted from the German—By a member of St. Joseph's Society, Mill Hill, London.

This is a valuable little book, savoring of the true Missionary spirit. Some works on foreign missions are occasionally somewhat open to criticism on the ground that they are tacitly intended to show forth the merits of some particular society as being preferable to others. This book cannot be accused of any shadow of so-called selfishness on that score. The merits of all missionary societies are honestly acknowledged. It contains useful information upon the work of Foreign Missionary Societies, especially of the three great societies of The Propagation of the Faith, The Holy Childhood, and that of St. Joseph, Mill Hill, London, as well as a short epitome of all the foreign Missionary Societies established in the last century.

Our Lord's last command—"Go and teach all nations, etc.," is the foundation upon which the author bases his missionary claims for the Church. The line of thought is well preserved, setting forth the manner in which this command was obeyed by the Apostles, by the Popes throughout the ages, and is being carried out by the Church of to-day; and the oft-raised objection—the primary necessity of home missions and the lack of means to procure their success—is adroitly refuted and explained. The whole world was to be the field of Apostolic labor; the Apostles were to go to the Gentiles, even though the majority of the Jews remained unconverted. There was to be no limitation in the effecting of the divine mission entrusted to them. Freely had they received, they were to give freely in return. The author makes it clear that it is incumbent upon every Catholic to interest himself, according to his means, in the work of Foreign Missions. It is a useful and instructive book in the hand of Catholic and non-Catholic alike, more especially to the Catholics of the British Empire, to whom the appeal is primarily made.

The Formation of Character. By Ernest R. Hull, S. J. Sands & Co., London; B. Herder, St. Louis, Mo. Pp. 123.

To educate without developing character is with Father Hull, like building a cathedral without a sanctuary. The present treatise was written in response to many requests from young parents for direction in the training of their children. While meeting their needs, however, the author has also spoken to teachers and to those generally who are engaged in the work of character formation. His book is concisely written; perhaps too much so for popular reading. It contains instructive chapters on the nature, principles, and ideals of character, and gives special attention to the "all-around ideal" of the cultured Christian gentleman. Many helpful and illuminating suggestions appear on watching the growth and development of character. Some chapters on psychology and physiology will offer difficulties to those not familiar with the terminology of scholastic and modern philosophy, but the practical direction and counsel with which these and other chapters abound will be readily understood and appreciated.

Outlines of Bible Knowledge, edited by the Most Rev. S. G. Messmer, D. D., D. C. L., Archbishop of Milwaukee, with 70 illustrations and four maps. Herder, 1910, pp. xii, 298.

These Outlines, based on Dr. A. Brüll's Bibelkunde, are a welcome contribution to our Catholic Biblical literature. The Most Reverend Editor has improved the German original in many respects and has made it "a comparatively complete, though still elementary manual of the Bible." He has added two excellent chapters of his own on the political and domestic antiquities of the Jews, and, by way of Appendix, the Encyclical Letter of Pope Leo XIII on the study of Holy Scripture. The work is divided into three parts: Biblical History and Literature, Biblical Geography, and Biblical Archæology. The first part is confined to a clear and precise statement of the great biblical questions, leaving aside the modern controversies which, as the editor points out, are not wholesome food for the faithful at large. We notice with pleasure that the second half of the book is devoted to Biblical Geography and Archæology. Rightly so. To acquire even a common knowledge of the Bible, the student must possess exact information about the countries and places where the Bible was written, and about the manners and customs of the Jews, who were the depositaries of the Old Testament Revelation. The book is intended especially for teachers and students of Catholic theology, but we heartily recommend it as a text-book for our Catholic High Schools and Colleges, for it is the only elementary work of its kind in our Catholic English Literature.

A. VASCHALDE.

A History of the United States for Schools. By S. E. Forman. Pp. 420 + lxxi (appendices and index): The Century Co., New York, 1910.

In a volume of moderate size Dr. Forman has prepared an excellent outline of the history of the United States. Inside the first cover is a map showing the distribution of the aboriginal races when the white men began to explore this country. This classification is based on linguistic differences among the Indians. Throughout the work are many good maps which indicate the

territorial growth of this republic. The illustrations are both attractive and abundant.

Of the era of discovery and the succeeding period of exploration there is a clear, correct and interesting acount. The Norse discovery is disposed of in a footnote. Though the voyages of the Northmen had no permanent results, they appear to deserve a little more consideration. The remarkable activity of the Franciscans and other Friars is passed over without observation. It is to these spiritual heroes that we are indebted for our first knowledge of Central Asia and for much of our information concerning China and other eastern countries in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

The familiar legend about Queen Isabella's jewels is given a place in the section that treats of the discovery by Columbus. Some historian should set this pretty fable at rest. Seven-eighths of the cost of that expedition was furnished by the *Santa Hermandad,* a quasi-military organization that was empowered to levy and collect taxes. Who furnished the remaining one eighth, the share of Columbus, we do not yet know.

The colonial era is treated in a concise and interesting manner. In the author's accounts of the early settlers in England's colonies the "Scotch-Irish" appear to be given the place of prominence. This is not strictly correct, for while a majority of the settlers from Ireland were of Scotch descent, a great number of Celtic Irish came to America even at that early period.

The sketch of the Revolitionary war mentions the spectacular flight of John Paul Jones but fails to notice the many useful services of Captain (subsequently Commodore) John Barry. In this as in some other particulars the author follows the dusty path that has been trodden by generations of text-book writers. The extent of French assistance during the war for independence could hardly have been suggested to the student by a brief description of the splendid fleet that had defeated the British off the capes of the Chesapeake before the surrender at Yorktown.

The author's explanation of the causes of the Mexican War is not that given in his extended work by Hubert Howe Bancroft. The pro-slavery party in the United States desired more territory for the expansion of their peculiar institution, and in the chaotic condition of affairs in Mexico they found a pretence for wresting from that feeble power a considerable portion of her territory.

It is true that the sister republic was given for the southwest a considerable sum of money.

In discussing the Civil War, Lincoln's plan of reconstruction is passed without observation. That was the mode under which Tennessee was restored to her normal relations in the Union. To comprehend fully the actual reconstruction instituted and guided by Congress it is necessary to know what Lincoln had done to bring about a restoration of former conditions.

Teachers who are not well acquainted with their American history will find of much value the prepared questions following the successive chapters. The "Review and Reading References" have been prepared with no little skill. The volume, which is profusely illustrated, contains a series of excellent colored maps. In a few instances, indeed, the author follows the time-honored though unscientific method of treating topics; however, on the whole, the narrative is clear and accurate.

CHARLES H. MCCARTHY.

UNIVERSITY CHRONICLE.

Patronal Feast of the University. On Thursday, December 8, the Patronal Feast of the University was celebrated by a Pontifical High Mass in the Assembly Room of McMahon Hall. The celebrant was Right Reverend Bishop O. B. Corrigan, Auxiliary Bishop of Baltimore. The preacher was Reverend John Webster Melody, D. D., Professor of Moral Theology,

Feast of the Conversion of St. Paul. The feast of the Conversion of St. Paul, the patronal feast of the Faculty of Theology, was celebrated by a Solemn High Mass in the Assembly Room of McMahon Hall on Wednesday, January 25. The celebrant was the Rev. Charles F. Aiken, D. D., and the preacher was Reverend Patrick J. Healy, D. D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History.

Lectures on Aristotle. A series of six lectures on "Aristotle and His Influence in Modern Times," is being delivered in Brooklyn, N. Y., at the Academy of Music, under the auspices of the Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Sciences, by Reverend William Turner, S. T. D., Professor of Philosophy. The following is the list of dates and subjects:

Jan. 6—"Aristotle's Life; His Relation to Socrates and Plato; His Influence on His Own Times; His Writings; the Character of His Genius."

Jan. 13—"Aristotle as Founder of Logic; Aristotle as a Scientist; Subsequent Development of Aristotelian Logic; Aristotle's Influence on Subsequent Scientists."

Jan. 20—"Aristotle as a Psychologist and Metaphysician; His work on the Soul; His Metaphysics; Later Interpretations of His Doctrines in the Commentaries.

Jan. 27—"Aristotle's Ethics, Theory of the State and Theory of Art."

Feb. 3—"Aristotle in Relation to Medieval Christianity."

Feb. 10—"Aristotle and the Humanists; His Influence on Modern Science, Philosophy and Literary Criticism."

Publications by Professors. In the November number of the *Psychological Review* there appeared a study from the Psychological Laboratory of the University, by Rev. Dr. Moore, entitled "The Influence of Temperature and the Electric Current on the Sensibility of the Skin." It is an attempt to investigate the relation between mind and body in the sphere of tactual sensation. That some such relation exists is a fact of experience. The value of the present article consists in making use of the methods of the modern science of physical chemistry to show on what precisely that relation depends. Strictly speaking, it is a physiological rather than a psychological study, for it is concerned with the organic conditions of sensation. The author finds that the sensibility of the skin is a function of the concentration of cathode ions in the tissues and that the same laws hold for the sensibility of the skin as for the irritability of muscle and nerve.

About the same time there appeared an article by the same author, which appeared as Vol. 1, No. 2 of the *University of California Publications in Psychology.* This is a long experimental study of the old metaphysical problem of abstract ideas. It gives a history of the experimental literature of the problem which has grown only within the last few years to considerable dimensions. It then proceeds to show by purely experimental methods that in the process of abstraction there is, as a matter of fact, more than sensations and mental images, thus lending empirical evidence to the truth of one of the most important positions of scholastic philosophy.

William C. Robinson, LL. D., Professor of Law at the Catholic University, has recently published a new and greatly enlarged edition of his deservedly popular work on *Elementary Law,* now widely used by students throughout the United States. In this text-book, especially in this new edition, Professor Robinson has endeavored to set before the student the universal and established rules of law, now in force in this country, in such detail and with such exactness as to dispense the student from a further study of a number of its ancient and well established branches, and to equip him for recourse

to larger text-books and leading cases in his investigation of the more important and more progressive departments of the law. For use in connection with this statement he has collected several thousand valuable collateral readings from the standard treatises, thus opening to the student a vast field for legal research, to be explored by him according to his opportunities and zeal. Professor Robinson was for many years in the Law School at Yale University and is the author of many important works, among them being "American Jurisprudence," "Forensic Oratory," and "Law of Patents."

The Department of Celtic. The Department of Celtic at the Catholic University has recently received from the Gaelophone Company a complete set of phonographic records of Irish, for which Dr. Dunn, head of the Department, has prepared a book of texts in Irish and English; the book was printed in Ireland with Irish ink and on Irish paper.

These records and the text-book should be a boon to Gaelic classes as well as to the private student who has not a good native teacher at hand. One of the greatest advantages of the system is that it can be used for a few spare minutes or for hours at a time. The records were made in Ireland and consist mostly of dialogues between a Connachtman and a Munsterman. The method followed is the natural one by question and answer based on actual everyday topics in which occur the very words a speaker of Irish has most need of. There are, besides, typical folk-tales, and songs with Irish words and master-recitations by the leading men of letters in the Gaelic movement in Ireland.

The Gaelophone Company has brought out a neat little leaflet of "Pithy, pointed Paragraphs for every Irishman to read," which will be sent free on request to their address, K. of C. Building, New Haven, Connecticut.

Department of Oriental Languages. The Rev. Dr. Vaschalde of the Department of Oriental Languages is preparing for the Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium an

edition of the "Book of the Union," written by Abbot Mar Babai (569-628). This treatise is one of the most important in Syriac literature. It discusses many interesting questions concerning the union of the two natures in Christ, and throws considerable light on the great Christological controversies which divided the Syriac Church in the fifth, sixth and seventh centuries; for example, on the definition of nature, hypostasis, person, and union. This book is still considered by the historians of the East as their official theology on the Incarnation. Its publication will be a valuable contribution to Oriental patrology.

Society of St. John Chrysostom. Within the past few months a Society known as the St. John Chrysostom Society has been formed at the University. Its purpose is to study historical and liturgical questions bearing on the Oriental Churches. The officers recently elected are: Honorary President, His Eminence, James Cardinal Gibbons, President, Rt. Rev. Monsignor Thomas J. Shahan, Rector of the Catholic University; Vice-President, Rev. Henry Hyvernat, S. T. D., Professor of Semitic Languages and Biblical Archæology at the University; Treasurer, Rev. Paul Sandalgi; Secretary, Rev. Sigourney W. Fay.

The Catholic Convert League. The Catholic Convert League of Washington, D. C., which was formed last year at the Apostolic Mission House on the feast of the Immaculate Conception and has now a membership of over one hundred, meets, every month in McMahon Hall, Catholic University.

The principal method of carrying out the expansive apostolic work which the League holds out to all Catholics, whether they be converts or not, is to extend the hand of welcome to converts who have sacrificed friends and much that is dear to them in order to embrace the true faith. It has also appointed four committees; a correspondence guild for the purpose of answering inquiries from prospective converts; a book-rack committee for the purpose of disseminating Catholic literature

at the doors of churches; a press committee, and a library committee, which is endeavoring to stir up the interest of Catholics in placing Catholic books in public libraries.

The appeal which this autumn was sent out by the committee, inviting the coöperation of Catholics in twenty-three cities of the United States, has been the means of arousing interest in a number of quarters.

The New Gymnasium. The new gymnasium of the Catholic University has been recently completed and placed at the disposal of the students. This building satisfies a long felt want in the life of the undergraduates, who were before this without the necessary means of developing their physical activities during the winter months.

Already, great interest has been made manifest attending indoor sports and the organization of the Freshman, Sophomore and Junior class teams in basket-ball has aroused class spirit to its highest pitch. The Athletic Association of the University, grasping the opportunities afforded by the new gymnasium has recognized basket-ball as a major sport, and a Varsity team, composed of the most efficient athletes registered in the various departments, will make their debut in this branch of sport.

Indoor running has also been materially aided by the newly acquired place to train, and the track team will attend all the indoor athletic carnivals given in Washington, Baltimore and Richmond in the Spring. However, the greatest advantage of the gymnasium lies in the fact that the numerous candidates for the baseball team will be able to secure an early start in throwing the ball under cover during the colder months. This will enable the batteries to be in prime condition by the opening of the season, which will start during the latter part of March.